

The Association of
History Teachers
of the Middle States
and Maryland :: ::

Proceedings

7694

NUMBER 19
and
NUMBER 20

1921 *and* 1922

PRICE ONE DOLLAR

THE
NORTH CAROLINA COLLEGE
FOR WOMEN
GREENSBORO,
N. C.

Class_____Book_____

Accession_____

The Association of
History Teachers
of the Middle States
and Maryland :: ::

Proceedings

NUMBER 19
and
NUMBER 20

1921 *and* 1922

PRICE ONE DOLLAR



CONTENTS

HAVERFORD MEETING, MAY 6-7, 1921.	Page
I. The Revolution of 1912, <i>Professor Irving S. Kull</i>	1
II. A long Look into the Future, <i>Mr. Wilford M. Aiken</i>	8
III. The Relations of the English Government to the Laborer, 1821 and 1921, <i>Dr. Witt Bowden</i>	15
IV. German Views of War Responsibility, <i>Professor Raynor W. Kelsey</i>	25
SWARTHMORE MEETING, NOV. 26, 1921.	
V. Disarmament, <i>President Frank Aydelotte</i>	26
VI. The Need for American Sea Power in the Pacific, <i>Mr. William H. Gardiner</i>	30
NEW BRUNSWICK MEETING, MAY 5-6, 1922.	
VII. Notes Concerning Meeting.....	32
VIII. The Significance of Some Early Plans of Union, <i>Professor Raynor W. Kelsey</i>	33
WILMINGTON MEETING, DEC. 1-2, 1922	
IX. The New Constitutions of Europe, <i>Dr. Lindsay Rogers</i>	45
X. Political Leaders of Present Day Europe, <i>Professor William E. Lingelbach</i>	51
XI. Treasurer's Report.....	63
XII. Constitution.....	64
XIII. Officers of the Association for 1921-22, 1922-23.....	65
XIV. List of Members.....	67



HAVERFORD MEETING

May 6-7, 1921

HAVERFORD COLLEGE, HAVERFORD, PENNSYLVANIA.

Friday Evening, May 6, 1921, at seven o'clock. SUBSCRIPTION DINNER. Speaker: Dr. Herbert Adams Gibbons.

Saturday Morning, May 7, 1921, at ten o'clock. ADDRESS OF WELCOME, President W. W. Comfort of Haverford College.

RESPONSE, by Dr. Albert K. Heckel, Lafayette College, President of the Association of History Teachers of Middle States and Maryland.

THE REVOLUTION OF 1912

BY PROFESSOR IRVING S. KULL,

RUTGERS COLLEGE

Lincoln, on the battle-field of Gettysburg, gave famous expression to a political faith—"government of the people, for the people and by the people." This conception, in turn, rests upon the no less famous words of Thomas Jefferson—"All men are created equal." In the words of these two men we have the most compelling ideal in American history, the ideal of democracy. We have not always been a democracy. It has been with us a growth. Its progress has been uneven and with periods of retrogression but withal sustained by a faith that is today our greatest national heritage and surest refuge.

This development in the United States has produced a series of revolutions—1800, 1828, 1860 and 1912. This paper has to do only with the last of these movements but, in passing, it should be noted that each of them involved a transfer of power from one section of the country to another and, at least for the time being, the broadening of the popular base on which government rested.

The Civil War brought about the transfer of political power from the slavocracy of the cotton states to the industrial East. The generation from Jackson to Lincoln saw the rise of a remarkable civilization in the South. Black soil, black men and cotton constituted its base. Its superstructure recalls to mind old feudal England, with its manor houses and broad avenues, retinues of servants, fair ladies and hospitality. Political power and wealth grew out of this thing. Then was erected for its support a political philosophy and a religious sanction. The Declaration of Independence passed into disrepute and college professors said that men were not created equal. Country preachers on small pay might be opposed to slavery but great divines saw in it the scheme of God. Their Calvinistic logic playing with the fate of Ham revealed how unequal races could live in harmony and how the souls of black men could be saved for the Kingdom of Heaven. Here was a society of privilege and one in which only a few thousand made up the ruling class. Those with only a few slaves or none voted with their superiors as New England mill hands later voted protective tariffs for their superiors.

For the purpose of this paper the significant thing about this South of cotton and slavery is that it ruled the nation. It could not elect a majority of congressmen but it did send up half of the senators and, relying upon industrial and capitalistic interests of the North with business in the South, it controlled legislation. With \$200,000,000 owed by the South to the North in 1860, it is understandable why such as August Belmont opposed anti-slavery. After the same fashion the cotton magnates controlled the presidency and the Dred Scott decision shows how well the Supreme Court was held in hand. The instrument of this control was the Democratic party. Government in the generation before 1861 was, in the main, controlled by a few thousand magnates of a great privileged interest. The Declaration of Independence had been thrown into discard. Democracy was unpopular. It is a chapter in sectional and minority rule which well repays study.

I have said that the Civil War effected a transfer of political power from this slavocracy to the industrial East. That is true and the Civil War was an episode in sectionalism. But this war, in no small measure, grew out of a moral and idealistic movement. There were men who said that slavery was wrong; that men were equal. Not the great and rich said this but common men said it. Lincoln said it, and when in 1854, fired by moral purpose, he

reëntered politics, the equalitarian spirit of the common man had found a leader. The election of 1860 was a victory for democracy. True, the victory was short lived and Lincoln's matchless words on the field of Gettysburg were to remain only a bit of consummate English to grace an episode. What might not Lincoln have done for democracy had not necessity forced him to let loose the passions of war and of hatred, and opened the way for selfish aggrandizement! When he was shot there was rejoicing among the Eastern radicals. The man who was too disposed to act on the Golden Rule was dead. Where Lincoln might have won, Johnson was worsted. The democratic movement that in large measure brought on the war was killed by the war and this left the sectional revolution the chief result: control of the American government passed from the South to the East, from the slave baron to the rising industrial. Here it was to remain until 1912.

The election of Woodrow Wilson to the presidency in that year and of supporting majorities to the houses of Congress constituted a political revolution of very great magnitude. It threw out of power the industrial East and gave government to the agrarian South and West, and, in measure, to labor, the agrarian's chief social ally: it threw out of power a privileged minority and gave government a new social base, one of larger numbers and of the unprivileged. In part it was a revolution in sectionalism but of greater importance, it was a revolution in democracy.

What had happened in the half century between the overthrow of the slavocracy and the election of Woodrow Wilson was the rounding out of the Industrial Revolution in the United States in its technical and financial aspects and the intrenchment of the industrial régime in the national government. This involved as in the day of the South the perfecting of a civilization—a political and social philosophy, the integration of the intellectual and cultured classes and withal minority rule by a group of industrials and financiers perhaps no larger than the ruling group of cotton magnates of the '50s. This development did not go on without protest; in fact the clamor of the unprivileged mounted in volume. Bryan in 1896 threw the old order into consternation; Roosevelt gave to this protest a respectable standing and Woodrow Wilson carried it into power.

Now to enlarge: The distinguishing aspect of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is the Industrial Revolution. It has introduced into the world a new power—the power of capital. It is

this Revolution that has given the character to our history since Lincoln. It may be dated from the War of 1812, with particular acceleration since 1830: the necessities of war gave it artificial stimulation and from then on to the end of the century its development outstripped public comprehension. Stretching from this great city of Philadelphia to New York and on to Boston, then west to Buffalo and Pittsburg, to Chicago and St. Louis lies the industrial belt. In this region, developed the distinctive marks of the industrial age. Cities like mushrooms sprang into being over night. Rail and wire and press tied them all together. "Industries that had to do with wool, cotton, iron, coal, copper. . . increased their returns, enriched their owners, and herded millions of human beings about their smoking chimneys, men who spoke strange tongues, lived in dingy hovels, and worked for wages that" barely kept body and soul together. Prosperity was the result. Truly here was a civilization that defied understanding. Real estate values rose beyond wildest dreams, bank and industrial stocks doubled and quadrupled in value and price. "Rich men grew to be millionaires and millionaires grew to be masters of hundreds of millions." Never was anything like it. Business jumped over state lines and became national; markets became as extended as the railroads. Today the meats of Armour and of Swift are distributed from coast to coast as are Standard Oil products and Wrigley's gum, the clothes of Hart, Schaffner and Marx and Sun-Kist oranges.*

In the dominant industries, competition was eliminated and trusts were organized at figures exceeding government expenditures. Trusts became bigger than government and States could not touch them. Then came imperialism. The piling up of surplus profits led to a demand for foreign trade and fields for capitalistic investment. The result was the acquisition of the Philippines and the Caribbean protectorates. And so has capital demanded intervention in Mexico as did the slave-owners in the '40s. This suggests one side of this industrialism. Another side has to do with the control of government.

*The quotations in this paragraph are from Professor W. E. Dodd's *Woodrow Wilson and His Work*, New York, 1920, the fourth chapter of which has been drawn upon heavily for this paragraph. Professor Dodd's book is the best treatment of its subject. Several chapters of C. R. Lingley's, *Since the Civil War*, New York, 1920 contain significant data in concise form.

What Lincoln might have made of our American government remains only speculation but to the war-enriched East and its radical politicians, Lincoln's love of common men and his belief in equality did not synchronize with their self-interest. To them his generous hand extended to the defeated South looked too much like "peace without victory." The death of Lincoln guaranteed the supremacy of the industrial East. Defeating Lincoln's plan of reconstruction, its representatives in Congress held the South in subjection and, by exploiting war psychology, kept the West in leading. At the same time, while negro suffrage was being defeated in northern states, it was forced upon the South in the interest of Republican majorities. And thus did eastern industrialism, with the Republican party as its instrument, come into power. It gained control of Congress, of the presidency and of the courts.

A particular asset of this rising power was our eighteenth century constitution. It was drafted by men who did not believe in democracy for men who did not believe in government or at best believed it a necessary evil. It was drafted in the full enthusiasms for laissez-faire and so hedged government about by checks and balances that it has been the surest refuge of vested interests. To this was added the fourteenth amendment which denied to any state the right to deprive any person of his property without due process of law. By virtue of it corporate interests wiggled out from under state law into a field where there was no national law. Nowhere in the world has the Industrial Revolution worked itself out in such uncontrolled fashion as in the United States.

Now, independent of governmental interference, the industrial forces proceeded to use government for their own ends. They voted themselves railroad land grants equal in bulk to five times this great state of Pennsylvania, and protective schedules in the tariffs. Water and timber rights, mineral resources and public service franchises, all fell into their hands. By the end of the century government had come to be an asset of the business man. Mark Hanna stands a monument to this conception.

Hanna also represented the evils of this industrial era. The cartoonist represented him with dollar marks across his bellied front and greed on his face. This marvelous civilization had not been consummated without gross evils and maladjustments. Corporations gained monopoly privilege. Competition was destroyed and prices raised to the taste of capital. Railroads entered into agreements for undue advantage and coöperated with favored

corporations to destroy their competitors. Mineral and other resources went to the few. Labor lost its freedom and became subject to capital. The public was exploited. This meant concentration of wealth. Statistics of 1915 reveal that two per cent of our population own three-quarters of the entire wealth of the country. At the opening of this century, ninety-five per cent of the important railroad lines were in the control of six groups of influential persons which in turn were dominated by fourteen individuals. The Morgan and the Standard Oil groups were so in control of the banking interests that it is doubtful if any great enterprise could have been started without their assistance. The United States government has hardly dared act at any time independently of a half-dozen Eastern financiers. Here was a society in which democracy had broken down. True, the Declaration of Independence was still a 4th of July ornament and the Gettysburg speech adorned the walls of public buildings but neither was supposed to interfere with work-a-day affairs any more than the Sermon on the Mount. Equality of opportunity had broken down. Industrialism had established the rule of a class and set up again the philosophy of John C. Calhoun.

When Mark Hanna put Mr. McKinley into the presidency, unbridled industry and its control of public life had reached its zenith. But the 6,000,000 votes and more given to Mr. Bryan in that year of 1896—a vote larger than any successful candidate had ever received—measured the discontent in the country. This was partly sectional and partly class. Every year for a generation prior to 1896 the returns of the farms of the South and West had declined in purchasing value. The price of wheat fell from \$2.50 a bushel to sixty cents, that of corn from \$1.50 to forty cents. Cotton fell in price from forty cents a pound to six and five cents. National debt, banking operation, and railroad finance operated to the disadvantage of both the South and West. Both sections were debtors to the East and both were agrarian with the farmer's distrust of monopolies. War passions, fanned by politicians, had prevented the combination of these two sections but now continued grievances and the rise of a farther west without war traditions effected a union which, with allies from the labor class drove consternation into the hearts of Easterners. The Populism of the West had captured the Democratic party and run Mr. Bryan for the presidency. The issue of 1896 was obscured by the silver question. The underlying issue in the election of that year

was not the money question at all—rather it was the abuses resulting from the lawlessness of corporate wealth.

Mr. McKinley won the election and in spite of Bryan's 6,000,000 votes accepted his election as a mandate to stamp out radicalism. Aiding him was the Spanish war which gave the Republicans a chance to divert attention from domestic distress. But not for long. The shot that removed Mr. McKinley brought to the presidency the young radical whom the politicians thought they had successfully shelved. Virile and undisciplined, with a dramatic imagination and a love of show, Theodore Roosevelt sensed the meaning of Mr. Bryan's following and came forward as its champion. Mr. Bryan said that Roosevelt had stolen his clothes while he went in swimming, and, in a sense, he had. He had antagonized the politicians and great wealth of New York and now he brought into the presidency something like conviction in the rightness of the basic issues of the Democratic campaign of 1896. But Roosevelt's Congresses were committed to the principle of laissez-faire and unsocial conceptions of wealth, and they naturally wrote less into law than the words of the president had led the country to expect. Roosevelt's historical importance lies in his having kept stirred up the discontent that had produced Bryan.* Talking over the heads of Congress, he gave form to the nebulous thoughts of men and body to their demands. Then, when his administrations ended with actual achievements disappointingly small and the Dingley tariff still law and when it seemed that Mr. Taft was an instrument of the older order, discontent mounted again in protest. This time it could not be stopped but swept the industrial regime out of power. The election of Woodrow Wilson was a political revolution: a democratic revolution—"democratic" spelled with a small "d". The vast agrarian West and South supplanted the industrial East in government and corporate wealth gave way to farmers and labor; the rule of the privileged minority gave way to the people. I am not forgetting that Wilson won in 1912 on a minority vote but it must not be forgotten that those who followed the radicalism of Roosevelt that year would have no difficulty in keeping pace with the New Freedom, and that Roosevelt's electoral votes came

*This is not saying that if Mr. Roosevelt had had more sympathetic Congresses that he would have carried out a thorough-going progressive program. There was much in Mr. Roosevelt to suggest that his progressiveism was not the most thorough-going.

out of the democratic West. Democracy had won in a contest against privilege. The movement which found first clear expression in Bryan and the Democratic party in 1896, and greater consciousness and sense of right at the hands of Roosevelt came into victory in the Democratic success of 1912.

And it was just this victory of the Democratic party that constituted the revolution. The Democratic party was democratic. Though in part sectional, having greatest strength in the West and South, it was the party of the people and of the unprivileged, and it now gained the presidency and both houses of Congress.

The measure of this revolution is indicated in the legislation of the Wilson administrations. Its great acts cannot be analyzed here but it needs to be pointed out that the people of the country were the beneficiaries of that legislation as they had not been for a half-century. Human values again gained recognition and the processes of our national life were again squared with the standards of democracy as they had not been since the Civil War. Lincoln was justified: here was government not only for the people but by the people. 1912 constitutes a democratic revolution. Its counterparts are 1800, 1828 and 1860. This paper has had to do with only the last of these movements but Wilson is the spiritual heir of Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln.

A LONG LOOK INTO THE FUTURE

BY MR. WILFORD M. AIKEN

DIRECTOR OF SCARBOROUGH SCHOOL

Civilization's most immediate task is to preserve itself from destruction. The elements of demoralization and ruin are within it, as well as the elements of progress and glorious achievement. These forces war against each other and victory against the forces of disintegration is not yet assured.

Civilization has no more potent force within it than nationality, and it has no greater task than to discover a better way among nations. The spirit of nationality may become a weapon of destruction or it may become civilization's most powerful means of orderly progress toward mankind's supreme achievement—The

Kingdom of God on earth. "A Nation", says Renan, "is a soul, a spiritual principle. Two things which are, in truth, at bottom only one, constitute this soul, this spiritual principle. One is in the past, the other in the present. The one is the possession in common of a rich legacy of memories; the other is actual consent, the desire to live together, the will to continue to make the best use of the indivisible heritage received." Nationality dwells in the hearts and minds of men. It is a sentiment, and if that sentiment becomes towards other nations little, mean, suspicious, distrustful, aggressive, revengeful, the principle of nationality becomes a menace to the world and makes for the destruction of civilization, when—

"Nor public flame, nor private, dares to shine;
Nor human spark is left, nor glimpse divine!
Lo! thy dread empire, chaos! is restored;
Light dies before thy uncreating word;
Thy hand, great Anarch, lets the curtains fall,
And universal darkness buries all."

If, on the other hand that spiritual principle, that rich legacy of memory, that tradition to which patriotic feeling clings, is composed not of gloryings over others defeated nor of resentments against others victorious, but of those splendid sacrifices and great achievements which illumine the pages of history of every great people and constitute their peculiar contribution to the spiritual heritage of mankind, then the spirit of nationality makes for the healing of the nations and the blessing of the race.

This is fundamentally a matter of education. Whatever one may think of the Outline of History he must agree with Mr. Wells when he writes that "human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe". Whether the spirit of nationality shall become an agency of destruction or an instrument of healing and blessing depends, in large measure, upon the educators of the world. It is not sufficient that there should be friendly relations between governments; there must be goodwill between peoples. The attitude of the peoples of the world toward each other ten, fifteen, twenty years from today depends in large measure upon what the educators of the nations are teaching their boys and girls now. As a member of the British Cabinet said to me last summer, "The peace of the world is in the hands of the teachers of the world."

Is it necessary in this presence to show that education can mould the life of nations and determine their attitudes toward each other? I think it is not necessary. We know that education can do that. We know that it has done it. We need seek no farther afield than Germany for an example. The Boche was clearly the product of a deliberately planned scheme of education. Germany was wise enough even to use American schools to create a favorable attitude toward herself, and she succeeded in it to the extent of blinding us for many weary months to the real issues of the war.

Would any one question the need of a better way among nations? The new day we thought was dawning two years ago has faded into darker night than before. Concord, amity, trust have given place to discord, hatred and suspicion among even the closest of the Allies. Do you realize the extent of distrust and bitterness the masses of England and France feel toward each other and toward America today? It was not uncommon when I visited England and France last summer to hear expressions of bitterest feeling toward America. It is true that such feelings are to be found chiefly among the uninformed and less intelligent, but let enough people of that type feel that way, and say such things, and say them often enough, an atmosphere is created which requires only some untoward international incident to set it ablaze with war.

I was amazed one day, in conversation with an Englishman who was otherwise evidently of high intelligence, to hear him say something like this: "It is difficult for me to be patient with America. In fact I feel very bitterly toward your people. It seems to me you stayed out of the war to make all the money you could, and when you saw danger of losing all you had made and all your loans to the Allies by their defeat, you came in. Then you got out quickly as you could, only slightly injured, and left this torn and bleeding Europe to shift for itself". The amazing fact is that this man who failed so completely to understand our aims in the war is headmaster of a school of more than five hundred boys!

Let no one misunderstand me. Actual conflict is unthinkable. The leaders of thought in England and France deplore such feelings and statements as much as the more thoughtful men of America deplore similar evidences of bitterness of feeling among us toward them. We have our Hearst, and England has her Bottomley and the strength of their evil pens comes from the ignorance and prejudices of the people.

I found almost everywhere among responsible, thoughtful Englishmen an earnest desire to understand America, and to establish closer and more friendly relations with us. The same is true of thoughtful Frenchmen, but their eagerness is evidence that they see need for positive action to counteract the tendency among the less thoughtful and more easily prejudiced majority. In what way can positive action be taken? How shall the spirit of goodwill, which existed on Armistice Day 1918, among the allied nations, be restored and made to endure eventually among all the peoples of the world? Let us as educators give answer in so far as we are able.

We answer that it is not to be done by pacifists,—by wishy-washy sentimentalists,—that merely feeling goodwill is not sufficient. We answer that it is not to be done by propaganda. Propaganda, at best, is likely to be only half-truths; at worst, it is lies and falsehoods. In giving answer we would say that *genuine goodwill must rest upon solid understanding*. The greatest hindrances to international goodwill are ignorance and misconception. Nations are unbelievably ignorant of each other. We fear or despise what we do not understand. Those in France and England who feel ill will toward us do so chiefly because they do not know America. Those of us in America who suspect and distrust England and France do so because of ignorance and misconception.

There are conflicts of interests which have a solid basis of fact. But even these conflicts are sometimes more apparent than real. For example, most of us have come to take it for granted that there *must be* a clash of national interests in the struggle for possession of the markets of the world. But Mr. Vanderlip, the great and wise American financier and statesman, and others have pointed out the fact that it is not America's task to go out into the world to take its markets from others, but rather to create new world markets for her own products. But whatever the real obstacles are, it is the business of statesmen backed by public opinion to overcome them.

The difficulties arising from a real conflict of interests may do much less mischief than those arising from ignorance and misconception. What is the cure? "The cure for ignorance," said Lord Grey, "is knowledge; the cure for misconception is truth". It is our business as teachers to find out that knowledge; and teach it, to discover that truth and implant it. The truth is not always agreeable, but probably most of the disagreeable truths about each

other, we have already learned. But agreeable or disagreeable, we must not fear to know it or have it known.

In order that schoolmen may secure that knowledge and discover that truth it is desirable that they should know each other. I shall always be more vitally interested in knowing the truth about England and France and in causing that truth to prevail because I personally know and greatly admire many devoted schoolmen of our sister republic and our motherland. It will please you to know that plans are well under way for some of the strong men in education in these nations to meet in annual conference for this great purpose.

What should such a conference undertake? Nothing less than an understanding of true conditions in each nation represented. Let each group prepare statements in frequent conference before the time of the general meeting, of the ideals and purposes in education, industry, social and political life of the nation they represent. Then let these statements be presented to the whole conference for consideration and frank discussion. Wouldn't you welcome the opportunity to join in the preparation of statements which would set forth the truth about America? We pretend to teach it to our own children; why should we hesitate to discuss it with representatives of other nations? Wouldn't you like to hear a statement of British educators concerning the mind of labor in England now, and an opportunity to question them about other phases of English life and policy? Wouldn't it help us to understand the feeling of Frenchmen toward security forever from German aggression, if French schoolmen could sit down with us here today and talk with us frankly and informally about it? Why shouldn't such a conference discuss calmly and freely the causes of such friction as now exists or is likely to exist between France and America, between England and France, or between America and England?

A week or ten days of such discussion and frank exchange of views, preceded or followed by a wisely directed visit to some of the schools of the nation in which the conference is held, would, I believe, place the delegates in a position to return to their respective countries better equipped to wisely direct the course of education in the struggle against ignorance of other peoples and blind prejudice against them.

But the work itself must be done by many humble teachers in many quiet classrooms. Some of those who must do this work

are college and university professors; many of them are teachers in the elementary schools; the majority of them are secondary school men whose work must stimulate and direct large numbers of boys and girls in whose minds the great force which we call public opinion finds its abiding place.

In almost every field of school study and activity there are opportunities for the teacher who is seeking to wage war against ignorance and misconception among nations, but the teachers of the languages, literature, and especially the *social sciences* hold the strategic points. I fear we have failed to recognize our responsibility and to embrace our opportunity. I am told that no history of America after the separation in 1783 is taught in English schools and that until this year not a single course in American history has been offered in the universities of England. How can they understand us if they know nothing of the growth of the nation as it conquered a continent and achieved political salvation? On this side some of our history teaching has been so distorted as to be worse than none at all. It has sent out the young American who will probably never read any more history with a chip on his shoulder which he dares any Englishman to knock off. French schools teach little American history, and the ignorance of our high school and college graduates in the field of French history is amazing.

It is the great opportunity of the teachers of history, geography, language, and literature to establish that solid basis of understanding upon which the structure of international amity and concord must rest. The broadminded teacher of a foreign language has, as his objective, not only the teaching of the language as a means of expression, but its mastery by the student in order that he may through it enter with appreciation and understanding into the literature and life of a people. If one would really know a nation let him read that nation's literature for in its literature its spirit finds most adequate expression. A wider and more intimate knowledge of French literature even in translation will bind with stronger bands and establish even more firmly that strong friendship which has been ours from the beginning. I am quite sure that the binding force of the study of the English literature in American schools is beyond all computation. In spite of much irritation on both sides these two nations have kept the peace for more than one hundred years, and nothing has contributed more to that splendid achievement than the knowledge and love of a great literature we both call our own.

I doubt if any of us fully realize the opportunity that lies before the teachers of the social sciences. Can you imagine the result if all the teachers of geography and history in the nations should seriously set about the task of teaching through these subjects the truth about the others, the kinds of people we are, the ways in which we live, the ideals which have led us on and which grip us now? It seems to me that in these fields the possibilities of solid understanding are unusually great. No matter how much he may have read and studied since, the early attitude of mind towards other peoples of the man who has it in his power to shape America's foreign policy during the next four years was determined years ago in some quiet country school-room in Ohio with the illustrated geography or history on the desk before him. How those pictures stick! And so it was with those who are to be associated with him, and so doubtless it was with those who now control the destinies of the other great nations of the world. Back of every statesman stands some unknown teacher.

We teachers can do comparatively little to influence or direct these men now or to mould the public of today. That was done by a former generation of educators. We must look to the future and it must be with a long and patient vision. We should make a beginning. The great task should be entered upon. It is beset with difficulties. Mistakes could easily be made. Harm could easily be done. I hear someone say it is too big an undertaking for educators. Leave it to statesmen. Let us stick to our educational knitting. I can not see it that way. This is educational knitting.

The world seems to have forgotten already. In the midst of the war we swore that this must not happen again. We meant it then, for the horror of war was upon us. Our better natures cried out against it. But now we have gone back each to his own way and the iniquity of war is almost forgotten by us all. Causes which produced this war that we fondly called "the war to end war", are active and will surely produce another and more terrible war unless stronger forces overcome them.

The most pathetic incident I witnessed in Europe occurred in the ruined city of Soissons. We had started from the battered and broken cathedral of Rheims and the gaunt ruins of that city, and had driven all day through the devastation of the war area. It was indescribable and terribly depressing. It seemed as if one could never smile again. We went for a walk through the unlighted streets from which the debris had been cleared sufficiently

for one to pass. On both sides and at every turn fresh devastation stared at us. The gaunt skeleton of their shattered cathedral stood black against the fading sky. It seemed a city of the dead. Except for our party of five no one was to be seen and our footsteps echoed through the broken walls into the silent darkness of ruined homes. Suddenly, in the distance, faint sounds of music were heard. We doubted our ears. But it continued and we sought it out. Upon rounding a corner, we came sharply upon a gay sight, the people dancing upon the rough cobblestones of the street to the music of a five-piece band. The bright light from the door of an open cafe gleamed across the street upon No. 15 of that street. All that remained of house No. 15 was a bit of the front wall upon which the number was painted. Just below was a merry-go-round. When I inquired the cause of this rejoicing I was told—I wonder if they realized the irony of it—that the festival was in honor of the patron saint of their city—which was as a city forsaken. They were trying to be gay and forget,—to forget the devastation everywhere, to forget the horror and anguish of those terrible years, to forget that 1,200,000 heroic Frenchmen would never return to their homes, to forget the hopelessness of the days to come,—but they *cannot* forget. *We must not*. God forbid that we should forget. Whatever the history teachers of America can do to banish ignorance, remove misconception, allay prejudice, make misunderstanding more difficult, and war more remote, I am confident they will perform.

THE RELATIONS OF THE ENGLISH GOVERNMENT TO THE LABORER, 1821 AND 1921

BY DR. WITT BOWDEN,

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

My subject lends itself peculiarly to the temptation to formulate a theory of social progress. The modern student is fond of indulging in the belief, or at least the pious hope, that history is a record of advancement. If we should inquire rigorously of ourselves as to what we mean by progress, our unwonted resort to clear thinking might mar too many of our prized illusions. It is

not my purpose even to attempt a thing so unkind. In connection with my discussion of the legal and political status of the English laborer in 1821 and in 1921, I shall attempt no definition of progress but shall content myself with a contrast in bold outline. One very good reason for my decision is the fact that to attempt a definition of progress acceptable to all my hearers would itself be an illusion.

The relations of the English government to the laborer have assumed two main aspects. I shall consider first the policies of the government in regard to furnishing to the workers the aid and protection of the state, as in factory legislation; and secondly, the attitude of the government toward the processes of self-help carried on by the workers themselves.

The laborer of a hundred years ago looked in vain to the government for its direct intervention in his behalf. The policy of the government, to be sure, was to maintain what was then as in later times called law and order, presumably in the interest of the workers as well as of others. But that this presumption was in ill accord with the facts is evidenced by such events as the Manchester Massacre and the passage of the Six Acts, when peaceable workers were ridden down by the military and denied the most elementary liberties of self-expression enjoyed without question by all other classes.

Earlier laws had indeed afforded some measure of protection. In the time of Elizabeth, the government assumed responsibility for providing work, or failing in this, for furnishing public charity. Skilled workers were protected after a fashion by apprenticeship laws. Wages were to rise and fall in accordance with changes in the price of bread. The earlier attitude of the government has been criticized on the ground that it was based on the subsistence theory of wages, but the laws proposed to provide at least a bare subsistence, and in the early nineteenth century their enforcement would have been welcomed eagerly by the pauperized workers who, tilling the wheatfields, digging the coal, and tending the looms were nevertheless made desperate by hunger, cold, and rags for clothing. In 1821, some of these laws had been repealed outright, and others were dead letters encumbering the statute books. The poor law, to be sure, was still in operation, and in most cases it prevented actual starvation. But its inherent defects, combined with the manner of its enforcement, did much to keep the worker in a vicious circle of pauperism, degradation, and misery.

Nor were there any new laws of consequence dealing with the conditions of labor in a helpful manner. Practically the only serious gesture in that direction was the passing of the Factory Act of 1802, somewhat extended in 1819 — and this was literally only a gesture. The law, even as amended in 1819, applied only to children working in cotton factories. Children below nine years of age were not to be allowed to work in cotton factories; those there employed under sixteen were to work only twelve hours a day, except to make up for lost time; and pauper apprentices should be “instructed and examined in the principles of the Christian religion.” The most important thing about the law was the fact that it was not enforced. The prevailing conception by those in authority is summed up in a quotation from the *Edinburgh Review* of 1819, in reference to the defeat of a bill for the protection of the most helpless and most pitiable, perhaps, of all the many victims of the age, the chimney sweeps. “After all,” says the *Review*, “we must own that it was quite right to throw out the bill for prohibiting the sweeping of chimneys by boys — because humanity is a modern invention; and there are many chimneys in old houses that cannot possibly be swept in any other way.”

The government was thus indisposed to protect even the weakest, most dependent members of society, the children of the very poor, from the rigors of an economic system which claimed as its victims even the sturdiest of adult workers. It was even less disposed to protect the workers, either children or adults, from the dangers of ignorance. The prevailing attitude was probably one of indifference. When active interest was expressed, it was usually either in the form of a pious desire to prepare the souls of the poor for the future world, or else in the form of hostility to popular education on the ground that it would unfit the workers for their proper status in this world. Thus Windham in the House of Commons “confessed he never saw any man of low condition with a newspaper in his hand, and who read any of it, without comparing him to a man who was swallowing poison under the hope of improving his health.” There are those unkind enough to suggest that if the newspapers of Windham’s day were like those of later times, they were not particularly edifying to others as well as those of “low condition.” But the Honorable Member’s objection was of course not to the quality of the newspapers but to the ability of the workers to read them. The first national grant for public education was in 1833, in the sum of £20,000, which in

1839 was slightly increased. In this connection a recent writer makes an interesting comparison. The grant of 1839 for educating three million children was £30,000; the public funds appropriated in the same year for taking care of the horses of the young queen amounted to £70,000.

The virtual absence of state help for the working classes was due in part to the *laissez-faire* conception of government, but this has been unduly emphasized. When the landlords felt that they needed governmental protection from foreign competition in grain, *lassiez-faire* principles were conveniently forgotten and the Corn Law of 1815 was enacted. Because the influential merchants desired state aid against foreign shippers, the monopolistic navigation system was retained. Nor was the government slow to heed the cry of powerful manufactures that they must be protected from foreign competition in the use of machinery and in the exploitation of imperial markets. Employers, in their conflicts with their employées, were armed not with *laissez-faire* weapons but with laws and public policies which gave them multiplied assurance of victory in a struggle of uneven strength at best. In its one-sided application of *laissez-faire* policy, the attitude of the government was inevitably, though not very frankly, determined by the economic status of the various classes. The political weakness of the workers was a natural result of their economic helplessness. They had no vote, as a matter of course; and they were barred by tradition and by the debasing effects of poverty as well as by law from public offices. Their position was substantially what it had been in the days of Sir Thomas Smith, one of Elizabeth's secretaries, who wrote that day laborers, poor husbandmen, and all artificers "have no voice nor authority, . . . and no account is made of them, but only to be ruled and not to rule others." There was this difference in their position: under the inspiration of revolutionary ideals they had become guilty in the minds of their superiors of ambition punishable by more rigorous repression.

In consequence of this post-revolutionary policy of repression, the workers looked in vain to the government for assistance and even for neutrality in their attempts at self-help. Self-help was of course attempted either collectively or individually. Collective self-help assumed two main forms: (1) organizations such as friendly societies for administering mutual-benefit or insurance funds; and (2) organizations such as trade unions for dealing

collectively with the employer in reference to the terms of employment. Friendly societies were allowed to exist, but were subjected to rigorous oversight by the government, national and local. It was required that their rules and regulations must conform to law and must meet with the approval of local officials whose attitude was ordinarily determined by their affiliations with the employing class and by the prevailing policy of repression. Their *raison d'être*, in the minds of the authorities, was "to alleviate that immense charge with which the public was loaded in the support of the poor." Societies which tried to go beyond the narrow functions of alleviating the distress of their members resulting from sickness, unemployment or death were classed as "combinations" of an illégal character. By the common law against conspiracies in restraint of trade, by the "master and servant" doctrine, and by the Combination Acts of 1799 and 1800, collective action for securing higher wages or shorter hours or for influencing the employer in any way in respect to the terms of employment, was forbidden and severely punishable. These prohibitions were largely removed in 1824, but in 1825 the common-law penalties were restored. As a result, the government, even after 1825, particularly by the action of its military and its courts, made effective organization impossible. It said in effect to the worker, "You may combine, but must not use your combination to improve your condition as affected by the terms of your employment. You may have a gun, but you must not put a cartridge in it or pull the trigger."

Collective self-help the government either restricted by supervision or prevented by means of legal prohibitions and the courts and the police. With the principle of individual self-help, the government was nominally in accord. But the principle could hardly be said to have been translated into practice. With wages very generally below even the subsistence level, the worker could have no vital interest in the blessings of thrift or the gospel of getting ahead. With hours and conditions of labor not simply approaching but attaining physical and mental exhaustion, he could have no real part in the pursuit of culture or the development of personality. With his bread taxed by means of prohibitive duties on imports imposed by a government over which he had not the slightest control, he could hardly be expected to bring about a reduction in living costs. If he lived within reach of the forests and hunting parks, perhaps he could combine pleasure

with profit by angling for an occasional mess of trout or bagging a hare now and then. But no. This form of individual self-help was reserved for those unacquainted with the pangs of compulsory hunger. To earlier rigorous game laws were added in 1816 provisions to the effect that persons found at night in possession of a net or a snare were punishable by transportation for seven years. Landowners might capture game poachers by means of spring guns and man traps. In 1817 the game laws swelled the population of the prisons by 1200. Some indication of the character of the much admired historic English justice, as well as some suggestion as to the rigor of the game laws is afforded by two instances that may be cited. "Monday last," runs one account, "two young men underwent a flagellation at the public whipping post . . . for killing a hare." This public whipping was on the third day after their commitment. On the fourth day they were allowed to bring an appeal — after already having been whipped for being charged with the offense. The second instance involved not a base person who would stoop to poaching, but "a young man of good family [name omitted] who was carried before the Lord Mayor for attempting to put off some counterfeited bills." As befitted a young man of good family, his punishment consisted of being ordered "to go into the East India Company's service," and in the meantime he was "bailed out till a proper station in it could be procured for him."

Under conditions prevailing a hundred years ago it is perhaps not surprising that individual self-help in a form even more extreme than poaching was commonly resorted to — namely, theft. This the government naturally and laudably tried to prevent. Its methods of prevention — even in the case of the young man of good family — could hardly be called praiseworthy. The penalties, in general, were cruel in an extreme degree. It was at about this time that a proposal was made to substitute transportation for life in place of the death penalty for the theft of five shillings' worth of goods from a shop, whereupon Lord Ellenborough, the Lord Chief Justice since 1806, protested in the House of Lords on behalf of the government against such excessive leniency.

The transportation of offenders, while cruel, did nevertheless often mean an opportunity for self-help in the remote and sparsely settled colonies. Thus the government unintentionally promoted self-help in some cases, but those who desired to emigrate found

obstacles in their way, set up by the government. For the protection of the English manufacturers from foreign competitors, the emigration of workers having mechanical skill or knowledge of industrial processes was forbidden by law. Serious restrictions were imposed on change of residence within the country as well as on emigration. Opportunity for employment varied constantly with the shifting of industries and the rise of new enterprises, and the movement of labor to and fro rapidly increased. But the movement was constantly interfered with by the local authorities in administering the acts of settlement and the poor law. These authorities, because they were responsible for poor relief, were granted large powers in restricting freedom of movement on the part of actual and potential recipients of aid from the poor rates. The aim was to keep the poor rates as low as possible. The result was a serious governmental restriction of individual self-help by the workers.

In the case of the landlord in possession of income from his estates, or of the merchant with his long-established and lucrative trading connections, or of the manufacturer with his new machines and factories creating an unprecedented veritable tide of gold, — to these men, individual self-help meant one thing. To the wage-worker on the landlord's estate, or in the far-roving merchantman, or at the spinning-mule or the loom of the factory, it meant quite another thing. As a matter of fact, the landlords, the merchants, and the manufacturers were not denied, as were the workers, the advantages of collective self-help. They acted informally in an effective accord for promoting their interests, by utilizing their clubs and their social circles. They formed chambers of commerce and associations of various kinds. They controlled vast aggregations of capital, consisting oftentimes of a large number of small investments, which secured them the support of large groups. The big commercial and industrial firms were themselves instances of collective action. These classes acted collectively in controlling the government itself, and, quite naturally, in utilizing it for promoting their collective interests. But aside from the varied means of collective self-help available to the landlords, the merchants, and the manufacturers, their economic strength as individuals made individual self-help to them a reality. In the case of the workers it was the proverbial stone offered to those crying for bread.

I am not unaware of the fact that many persons today regard an emphasis on class distinctions and class history as undesirable. We are all Americans, or all Englishmen, and we should not think in class terms but in racial terms or in national terms. We are all workers (even granting that some of us devote our energies to "working" our fellows), and we should think in terms of common production and common service instead of in terms of class distinctions and class interests. But presumably the student of history is concerned not so much with what may seem desirable as with what his researches tell him is true. And certainly no very extensive research in English history is necessary to make obvious the fact that the government of England in 1821 was a government of, by, and for a class — and that class was not the working class.

But in the course of a hundred years the workers of England, in the face of most appalling difficulties, have asserted themselves so vigorously and effectively as to bring about a remarkable transformation in the relations between them and the government, both in respect to state aid and protection and in respect to the removal of restrictions on the processes of working-class self-help. The barest summary of the present relations of the government to the laborer must suffice.

The pious gesture of the government toward protecting the children in cotton factories in 1819 has given place to an elaborate system of limiting the hours and guarding the conditions of the labor not only of children but of men and women, and not merely in cotton factories but in practically every place of employment. Nor has the government limited its control to hours and conditions of labor. In many places of employment, notably in mines and sweatshops, public control has extended to the fixing of minimum standards of wages. The government has assumed the responsibility for giving to every child an opportunity to acquire the rudiments of an education, even to the extent of furnishing medical oversight and free meals in cases where the pupils would otherwise be unable to profit by school attendance. It has assumed responsibility not only for combatting ignorance but for insuring the worker against the most menacing of the dangers of modern industrial society. It accepts the view that accident and illness, old age unprovided for, and unemployment are dangers for which the individual worker is not normally responsible, and against which he as an individual is helpless. During the momentous

period from 1906 to 1914, the government took important steps toward translating the principle of social responsibility into a practical system of workmen's compensation, old-age pensions, labor exchanges, and insurance against sickness, unemployment, and incapacity to work. Even more significant as to the attitude of the government was the adoption of a revolutionary budget which aimed to secure funds for social legislation on the principle that taxation should not bare the cupboards of the poor, but should appropriate the surplus of the rich by taking into account not merely how much a person has but how he got it. The chief spokesman of the government in connection with its social and financial program, Mr. Lloyd George, even went so far as to lay down the principle of social responsibility for poverty itself, and to forecast the time when the demons of poverty should be "as remote to the people of this country as the wolves which once infested its forests."

The process of applying the principle of social responsibility was checked by the renewed struggle over Irish policy, and overshadowed completely by the Great War. But the policies adopted immediately preceding the war have been retained with slight changes, and the administration of the social legislation of this period may be said to constitute the relationship of the government today to the laboring classes in respect to state aid and protection.

No less thoroughgoing has been the transformation in the attitude of the government toward working-class self-help. By a series of changes in the laws relating to friendly societies, these organizations have been freed from governmental espionage; and they have been relieved of occasion for secretly exercising the functions of trade unions by the liberation of the unions themselves from common law and statutory disabilities, and in large measure from the hostility of courts and police. Co-operative societies, which constitute an extremely important instrument of self-help created since 1821, while laboring under what they allege are unjust tax burdens, nevertheless enjoy favorable legal status and protection.

As for individual self-help, practically all of the restrictions and impediments imposed upon the individual worker by the government a hundred years ago have been removed or mitigated. The incidence of taxation is more largely upon the rich; restrictions on emigration and change of residence have been removed; the dis-

sipation of the mists of ignorance by public education has made possible an all-important self-consciousness and assertiveness in place of the former submissive acceptance of an inferior status; and this new self-conscious assertiveness finds itself no longer obstructed by the obvious inequalities and assumptions of inferiority prevailing in the legal and political system of a century ago.

The present relations of the government to the working classes are largely determined, we have seen, by the the extensive program of social legislation carried out under the Liberal regime beginning in 1906. As compared with earlier policies, this program is relatively favorable to the workers, but its value has been the subject of lively dispute. There are those who contend that the more moderate Liberals were dominated by a man who was then a revolutionist, a veritable Jacobin, Mr. Lloyd George, who in reality was in league with the Laborites, and that the Labor Party was leading the Liberal Party by the nose in the direction of social revolution. Others contend that the Liberal Party was discreetly fooling the Labor Party by making a great to-do about insuring the workers against industrial dangers, and thus diverting attention and energy from the fundamental question of cutting off the dangers at the source by a reconstruction of economic society.

Without attempting to weigh the merits of this controversy, we may at least suggest that the present attitude of the workers savors of disillusion concerning the Liberal program of social reform. Nor is such an attitude hard to explain. Unemployment is today reaching vast if not unprecedented proportions. Housing facilities are hopelessly inadequate. The machinery for the peaceable settling of industrial disputes is very generally ineffective. Private fortunes unprecedented in size were created during the wartime emergency and maintained as a result of post-war reaction, in contrast with widespread and increasing poverty and wretchedness on the part of the workers. The former trusted champion of social reform has turned Tory chieftain. With such conditions as these confronting the workers of today, it is not unnatural that they should have grave misgivings as to the adequacy of the program of social reform that formerly aroused their enthusiastic support. In any case, they have gone far beyond that program, and are very generally sympathetic toward a policy aiming at the socialization of the land, the great natural resources, and the major industries. This program invol-

ves new and grave questions as to the functions of government — questions which the working-class organizations are themselves trying to answer in only a tentative way.

The fact that the workers are asking such questions, and trying intelligently and concertedly to answer them, is significant evidence of their remarkable advance during the past hundred years. The change they have already wrought in their legal and political status is commonly viewed by them, however, as merely a milepost on the way to the economic and social transformation of the country by the force of working-class self-consciousness and collective energy. Certainly their past achievements justify us in looking with profound interest on their present attempts, by means of an alliance of hand and brain workers, to bring about what they believe to be a more rational and more wholesome organization of society.

GERMAN VIEWS OF WAR RESPONSIBILITY.*

BY PROFESSOR RAYNER W. KELSEY,

HAVERFORD COLLEGE*

*Professor Kelsey's discussion has been printed under the title, "German Views of War Responsibility" in *The Historical Outlook*, October, 1921, pp. 233-236.

SWARTHMORE MEETING

November 26, 1921.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE, SWARTHMORE, PENNSYLVANIA.

Saturday Morning, November 26, 1921, at 9:15 A. M., MORNING SESSION.

DISARMAMENT

BY PRESIDENT FRANK AYDELOTTE

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE

If I, a novice in dealing with international relations, venture to speak on this subject before a body of history teachers, it is only because it has always been a belief of mine that the plain man should take more interest in international questions, and whatever I have to say will owe its whole value to the fact that it will be a sincere expression of the opinions of one such plain man. A great many such plain men and women are studying anxiously the Washington Conference, and to many of us it seems likely, whatever measure of success it may have, to mark a long step toward financial relief from the burden of armaments and toward peace. The value of this financial relief is not to be lightly estimated. Reduction in the tremendous toll which armaments at the present time exact from wealth and labor will give the working man and woman, the tax payers of the world, new heart in the difficult process of the revival of industry.

In the second place, the Conference marks a long step toward peace, not so much because peace is ensured by limitation of armament, for in my opinion this is not the case, as because it marks one of the first instances in history of international generosity practised by democratic nations. It is one of the most difficult things in the world for a democracy to act generously, to act with any sense of the benefit of another nation, to forget for a moment that insistence on the last tittle to its own right, that ruthless disregard of the rights of others which is ordinarily considered to be the demand of patriotism.

At the present moment one feels that there is no need to look beyond the conference, that the first duty of public spirited men and women is rather to concentrate on making the conference a success in spite of the difficulties in the way. We are going to hear this morning from Mr. Gardiner about the greatest and perhaps most interesting of these difficulties—the complications in the Far East. The conference started with a tremendous impetus following the dramatic proposals of Mr. Hughes but it is inevitable that this impetus must slow down and that there will be a great deal of quiet, and I am afraid, secret, talking to be done before the nations interested will agree on the details of this or any other proposal for disarmament.

For one, I think, as I have said, that the right thing at this moment is not to look beyond the conference but rather to help the conference to succeed. But a group of history teachers would inevitably want to look beyond it. I propose therefore to say a few words about what I think will be its significance and the next step to be taken after this one has been successfully completed.

I think it must be pretty evident to most people that the success of this conference will inevitably mark the end of the "splendid" isolation of the United States of America. This isolation was never complete and now that we have for the second time taken a plunge, so to speak, into world politics, we shall hardly be able to withdraw and take up again the attitude of mere spectator. Whatever agreement is reached in this conference will need enforcement, it will need supplementing, perhaps amending, or if things go as well as we like, further extension. A conference of this kind cannot meet, transact business, and adjourn *sine die*. I have heard it suggested that this conference may itself be the beginning of an eventual organization of the states concerned into a league. I have no opinion on that subject but of this I do feel sure that if the conference is successful one result will be the participation of the United States in some kind of a League of Nations. That League may only be a continuation of this conference, or it may be a world court, or it may be the Paris League, or it may be some compact between England, Japan, France, and the United States, or some group of these powers, acting as a vigilance committee to keep the peace.

Only by some such organization can the peace be kept. If there is any validity in the comparison so often made between war and duelling, one may cite the fact that duelling was not

stopped by prohibition of swords and pistols. Rather it was the fact that duelling was stopped which made the carrying of weapons unnecessary. The peace of the world can only be ensured by the substitution of some method of legalized fighting in the place of armed warfare. The causes of war, in unwise, irresponsible acquisitive foreign policy, in the human tendency toward oppression and injustice, can only be removed, or rather curbed, by something analogous to our private courts of law and to our national organizations for enforcing the courts' decrees. War is an attempt to remedy evils and to satisfy ambitions which appeal to the nations concerned as being justified. I am myself not a believer in war but I find it impossible, nevertheless, to believe that war is the worst of human evils. Another world war would probably end our Western civilization but it might well be disputed whether civilization would not decay and die no less certainly through the unrestrained ravages of robbery and unjust oppression.

In my opinion, the first significance of the conference then, is that it constitutes a reversal of the refusal of the United States to enter the League of Nations. I believe that the work of the conference will be to create an eventual association of the nations to put its decrees into effect.

The conference, or the league that grows out of it, will in my opinion deal with more than the territorial causes of war. It must also, I think, deal with matters of international trade and of international finance. We have as a nation steadily refused to hear anything about the cancellation of the European debts to this country or to take any particular interest in the financial condition of Europe. I do not believe we can maintain that attitude. I am not a financier. I do not know what we can do or ought to do to assist in restoring European finances to some measure of stability, but that we must, in cooperation with England, act eventually toward this end, I have no manner of doubt.

The conference has, I think, definitely marked the end of our national isolation, but it has had one effect, in my opinion, even more important. It has marked the beginning of a new virtue to which I can give no better name than international decency—the kind of generosity and love of fair play which crosses national boundary lines. All virtues have their dangers and of all human virtues, patriotism has in the past been perhaps most readily perverted to evil. The intense nationalism which has grown up in the world in the last few decades has had a good deal of the same

fanatical character as religious denominationalism. It has tended to make it a virtue on the part of any individual to be careless of the interests of any nation except his own, to refuse to understand the character or the aspirations of the peoples of any other country, to be willing to insult and injure them on any provocation. This attitude has been characteristic of those fine individuals who were perfectly ready to lay down their lives on a moment's notice in defense of the real or fancied interest of their own country. I think it is clear now to most thoughtful men, that, however fine such an attitude may be from a narrow point of view, it is absolutely inconsistent with the continuance of our civilization. We must learn as nations to consider other nations, to work in harmony with them, to sacrifice unimportant or even important interests of our own in order that their interests may be served. One of the first things we must learn is to understand what the character and what the interests of other nations are. We must cultivate what has been called the international mind.

Down that long road, as I see it, the world must journey to peace. If peace is ever to be reached a great deal of educational work involved in that program must be done by the men who are teaching history. I congratulate you on the public spirit and the traditions of generous public service of the history teachers of this country and I am glad to have this opportunity of wishing you success in the great work which is still to be done if America as a nation is to be educated up to the point where she will be a good citizen of the world.

It is for the reasons which I have outlined that I look upon the conference now sitting in Washington, not merely as an achievement but also as an opportunity. It is because I feel so strongly its educational implications that I have ventured to talk to you this morning about it. It is the best possible beginning. The first step is always the hardest, but there are many more to be taken and the next one is to do the work which you are already doing, of preparing the public mind of this country, after it has dealt with the question of armies and navies, to deal with the question of European finance, of Japanese and Chinese national interests, and the conflicting claims of Europe in Asia and Africa. Without that sound knowledge and generous tolerant public spirit which only a knowledge of history can give we could never attain to that attitude. If the international decency which I have mentioned, if due considerations of the interests of the world as

more important than our interests as a nation, demand the cancellation of the European debts, I think we must be prepared cancel them. We must learn to look upon the world as a unit into which national interests can be served only by serving the interests of the whole. This is, as I see it, America's opportunity and I believe that you as history teachers represent the greatest single force which will help us to understand that opportunity and to embrace it.

THE NEED FOR AMERICAN SEA POWER IN THE PACIFIC*

BY MR. WILLIAM H. GARDINER**

Japan has been increasing her holdings in the Pacific at an alarming rate. Her "mandate" islands acquired since the Great War threaten our position in the Philippines. Her encroachment in China are gradually nullifying our policy of the "Open Door." Her foot-hold in Russian Siberia is making her absolutely dominant in her part of the world.

The only possible way to checkmate this insolent imperialism of Japan is to make American sea power in the Pacific invincible. The late Rear-Admiral Mahan has shown how decisive sea power has been in modern history. Since the time of the Spanish Armada England has been the dominant colonial power because of her naval strength. She lost the American colonies only because her dominance on the sea lapsed for a moment. It would have been impossible to defeat Germany in the late war without the power of the British fleet.

*For other points of Mr. Gardiner's argument see his articles in *World's Work*, Nov. and Dec., 1921; *Atlantic Monthly*, Apr., 1922.

**As Mr. William H. Gardiner did not commit his remarks to writing, it is not possible to give more than a brief summary of his argument.

Similarly, sea power will determine the destiny of the Pacific. To-day the United States is practically helpless because we have no adequate naval base in the Far East. A naval war with Japan has seemed inevitable not later than 1924. The present Washington Conference was called to avoid it if possible. But we should never consent to a program that will mean a permanent naval inferiority for us in the Pacific. At present our fleet is helpless because it could not carry enough coal and other supplies to cross the Pacific, fight a battle, and then return to its base. The fortification of Guam and the Philippines, and the building of naval bases in those islands is essential. If this is not done Japan will continue to dominate the situation. Then our own possessions in the far Pacific will be threatened, and we shall default in our moral obligation to maintain the "Open Door" in China.

NEW BRUNSWICK MEETING

May 5-6, 1922.

RUTGERS COLLEGE, NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY

Friday Evening, May 5, 1922, at seven o'clock. SUBSCRIPTION DINNER. PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: Professor Raynor W. Kelsey, Haverford College, President of the Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland.

Saturday Morning, May 6, 1922, at ten o'clock. MORNING SESSION. ADDRESS OF WELCOME: Dean Walter T. Marvin, Acting President of Rutgers College.

TOPIC OF THE DAY: *The Justification for the Inclusion of the Several Social Studies in the Curricula of Secondary Schools.**

History: Professor Henry Johnson, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Economics: Professor L. C. Marshall, University of Chicago.

Geography: President W. W. Atwood, Clark University.

Sociology: Professor J. P. Lichtenberger, University of Pennsylvania.**

Government: Professor Edgar Dawson, Hunter College, New York City.

*These addresses are to be found in full in *The Historical Outlook*, December, 1922.

**The paper read by Professor Lichtenberger at the request of the chairman was one prepared by Professors R. L. Finney and E. C. Hayes. It appears under their authorship in *The Historical Outlook*.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF SOME EARLY PLANS OF UNION

BY PROFESSOR R. W. KELSEY

HAVERFORD COLLEGE

The plainest continuous thread that runs throughout American history is the growth of the theory and practice of union. It is traceable almost from the beginning of colonial settlement, and was boldly evident in the centralizing tendencies during the recent war. Over against the tendency toward union has always been and always will be set the forces of particularism. It is not true that the conjunctive force has always been right and the disjunctive wrong. Each force is natural and hence right. The practical problem of government has been to find the center of gravity between the two forces. This center has moved steadily in the direction of union or nationalism. Government has moved with it. The danger has been that of moving too slowly or too fast and thus inducing a condition of unstable equilibrium. The period of the Confederation, the Hartford Convention, the nullification controversy and the Civil War present the problem in outstanding and familiar forms. The purpose of this paper is to suggest the significance of several early plans of union with reference to the same problem.

In such a study one must begin, of course, with the New England Confederation established in 1643. At that time there was naturally no general sentiment favoring union. The centripetal forces had had too little time for development. Such union as could be accomplished was the immediate result of practical exigencies. There was danger from the French, Indians, and Dutch. "Whereas we live encompassed with people of several Nations, and strange languages, which hereafter may prove injurious to us"—is the motive for union expressed in the prologue of the Articles.

Yet the motive of self-preservation was not strong enough to save the union from a fatal divisive defect. The problem of proportional representation, so important and well-nigh disastrous in the Convention of 1787, was present as early as 1643. It was decided that each of the four colonies participating in the union should have two commissioners in the central council. Expenses of war, on the contrary, were to be apportioned on the basis of

population. As to soldiers, Plymouth, Connecticut and New Haven were to furnish forty-five men each and Massachusetts one hundred.

What of the justice of this arrangement? Massachusetts had a population greater than that of the other three colonies combined. As compared with the smallest of them, she had six times the population of New Haven and would pay taxes in that proportion. She would furnish more than twice the number of men for war. Yet she had no more voice than New Haven in deciding upon wars.

The palpable injustice of such an arrangement made Massachusetts a troublesome member of the Confederation. In 1653 when the commissioners from the other three colonies voted for a war with the Dutch, Massachusetts refused to be dragged into it against her will. It was provided in the articles that any six of the eight commissioners were competent to reach a decision. In the case in question seven were agreed, one of the Massachusetts delegates voting with the majority. Still the Bay Colony held off and finally succeeded in postponing action until the Anglo-Dutch war in Europe was ended, and thus the crisis was passed.¹ So we have a case of practical nullification in the first union of American colonies, and the question of how to apportion representatives and taxes was fairly launched on the sea of our political history.

Withal it should be remembered, however, that the New England Confederation functioned usefully and often actively for more than thirty years. It dealt not only with war questions, but with certain intercolonial problems in time of peace. The commissioners could recommend the passage of uniform laws in the various colonies, even as our recent conferences of Governors have done for the states. The Articles also provided for the return across colonial boundaries of fugitives from justice, and of escaped servants. It is a not uninteresting fact that the prototype of later fugitive slave laws should have come out of this first experiment in union, and from the heart of New England.

Passing from this first attempt at union it may be stated that the experiments in imperial consolidation will not be considered in this study. The most notable one was, of course, the Dominion of New England under Edmund Andros, established in 1686. At

¹Osgood, *American Colonies in the 17th Century*, 1: 404-406.

other times the same Governor was appointed over two or more colonies. During the various Indian wars that type of consolidation, to secure more effective cooperation in military affairs was frequently suggested. It was a type of union to be superimposed by the English government. It did not prove practicable and did not survive as a working idea. It is therefore omitted from consideration at this time.

A great revival of interest in the problem of union came at the time of the Indian wars in the reigns of King William and Queen Anne. The need for defense and the problem of military cooperation again raised the issue.

In 1697 William Penn proposed to the Board of Trade his plan for a union of all the colonies.² Each colony was to send two deputies to a central body to be called by the name of "Congress." A High Commissioner of the Crown was to preside over this Congress and be Commander-in-Chief in time of war. The Congress was to meet once a year or oftener in time of war and fix the quotas of men and money to be furnished by each colony.

Penn, as a man of peace, naturally proposed a union that was something more than a war expedient. The Congress was to meet at least once in two years during peace times. It was then to deal with problems concerning colonial commerce and concerning fugitives from justice.

Penn's plan of union is not far removed from the central idea of the New England Confederation, but he lifts the discussion to a higher level by suggesting a union of *all* the colonies. His inclusion of the subject of colonial commerce is of interest. It was that problem that led directly to the calling of the Constitutional Convention of 1787. In that Convention the control of commerce was given to the central government and thus one of the vital weaknesses of the Articles of Confederation was overcome.

The Plan of a Virginian, published in London in 1701, is the next great step to be noted.³ The name of the author is not known. He suggested a plan of union not greatly differing from that of William Penn, save in one important respect. Representation in the central assembly was to be proportional instead of equal. His reason for this was that the colonies "are so vastly

*A convenient collection of several plans of union, including Penn's, is in Carson, *100th Anniversary of the Constitution*, 2: 439 ff.

*For the Plan of a Virginian see Carson, as cited above.

different, for numbers of People, extent of Territory, and of the Value of them in their Trade, especially that to Europe." As Virginia at that time had a greater population than any other colony he assigned to her four out of nineteen deputies, the largest quota proposed.

Other plans of union were suggested during these two reigns, one by Peter de la Noy, one by the Board of Trade, one by Robert Livingston, and others of less importance.⁴ The main object sought was more perfect military cooperation in time of war, and the favorite method was by a consolidation of several colonies for more efficient administration.

None of the plans was put into effect, but American political theory was in process of growth. About three quarters of a century before the Revolution the idea had been broached of a union of all the colonies, with representation based upon population and trade, and with certain powers delegated to this central assembly.

The period from 1714 to 1750 may be passed over quickly. The chief activity of the union idea was in the war periods, but no considerable contribution was made. The war with Spain, 1718-1720 had some effect. Three plans of union were suggested in the years 1721-1722, one by the Board of Trade, one by the Earl of Stair, and one by Daniel Coxe, of New Jersey.⁵ By this time the idea of a central assembly, with delegates from each of the colonies, seems to have been well rooted, and is included in each of the three plans. The progressive idea of proportional representation is, however, not mentioned. The veto power for the central executive officer is first suggested by Daniel Coxe, in 1722, and this is another addition to the stock of ideas to be drawn upon later.

During this period there were several intercolonial conferences, chiefly to deal with Indian affairs, and in the decade between 1740 and 1750 leading men in England and America were again discussing the feasibility of a union of the colonies.

As we pass the year 1750 we are on the eve of the French and Indian war. The old menace to the border settlements was again darkening the horizon and thoughtful people were coming once more to the conclusion that in union there is strength.

⁴For the text of these plans see Carson, as cited above.

⁵For the text of these plans see Carson, as cited above.

In 1751 Archibald Kennedy, of New York, proposed that a number of commissioners from all the colonies be appointed to meet annually at New York or Albany "to fix their respective Quotas for the general Expence, and for erecting such other Forts and Block-Houses as may be thought necessary."

In 1752 Governor Dinwiddie, of Virginia, suggested to the Board of Trade in England that the colonies should be consolidated into two great dominions, a northern and a southern.⁶

The greatest contribution of the time, and of the whole period of American history until 1787, came, however, from another man. The Plan of Union promulgated by the Albany Congress of 1754 is well known. It seems, however, to the present writer that the contribution of that Plan to the idea of Union has never been sufficiently emphasized. The Plan of 1754 is so important, and was so thoroughly the work of one man, that it ought to be known forever as "The Franklin Plan."

The war was imminent. In 1753 Governor Dinwiddie had sent a party to build a fort at the forks of the Ohio. In May, 1754, Washington attacked a French party near the forks and shed the first blood of the war. On the 19th of the following month a colonial congress convened at Albany, under authority of a letter from the Board of Trade. Seven colonies were represented, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland. The congress was authorized to treat with the Six Nations and to concert measures of defence against the French. Interpreting the latter purpose liberally, Massachusetts instructed her commissioners to "enter into articles of union and confederation for the general defence of his Majesty's subjects and interests in North America, as well as time of peace as of war."

The plan of union agreed upon at Albany was based largely on some suggestions drawn up by Franklin before the Congress met. The resulting plan seems to have gathered up all the best planks in the earlier platforms of union. There was the idea of a central council, with representatives from the several colonies, as tried out in the New England Confederation, and suggested by William Penn in 1697. In this council, numbering forty-eight members, there was to be proportional representation as suggested by the "Virginian" in 1701. Massachusetts and Virginia were to have

⁶On Kennedy's Plan and Dinwiddie's suggestion see Carson, as cited above.

seven councillors each, Pennsylvania six, and from that down to the minimum of two members each from New Hampshire and Rhode Island. After a lapse of three years the councillors were to be reapportioned in accordance with the amount of taxes paid into the general treasury by the several colonies. The President-General was to have a veto power, as suggested by Daniel Coxe, in 1722. The laws passed were also to be transmitted to the King in Council, for approval or disallowance.

Now we come to the greatest contribution of all. It follows the enumeration of powers to declare war, make peace, and regulate trade with the Indians, purchase Indian lands and govern the new settlements on such lands. For these purposes the central council was granted a power never suggested in the earlier plans and never realized until the Federal Constitution went into effect in 1789. The Grand Council could raise and pay its own soldiers, build forts, and equip war vessels; and to pay the expense of such activities the councillors "have power to make Laws and lay and Levy such general duties, imposts or taxes, as to them shall appear most equal and just, considering the ability and other circumstances of the Inhabitants in the several Colonies, and such as may be collected with the least inconvenience to the people, rather discouraging luxury, than loading Industry with unnecessary burthens." For carrying out this plan of taxation a central treasury was to be established, with branches in the several colonies.

As to the type of taxes that Franklin had in mind we have it from his own writings that he favored excises or imposts on liquors, licenses on retailers, or excises on luxuries such as tea.⁷ Indeed, as early as 1751, in commenting on Kennedy's plan in a letter to a friend, Franklin had suggested a liquor excise to be levied in all the colonies, but the proceeds to be used exclusively for the central treasury.⁸ This passing suggestion shows that the idea of a self-sustaining union had reached some maturity in Franklin's mind before he broached it at Albany in 1754.

Before discussing the significance of Franklin's plan in the light of earlier and later history it is well to remind ourselves of its outcome. The plan gathered no following. As Franklin himself tells us, "the crown disapproved of it, as having too much weight

⁷See Franklin's "Short Hints" in Smyth (ed.), *Writings of Franklin*, 3: 198.

⁸Smyth (ed.), *Writings of Franklin*, 3: 42.

in the democratic part of the constitution, and every assembly as having allowed too much to prerogative; so it was totally rejected." Franklin's philosophical diagnosis of the trouble was as follows: "Every Body cries, a Union is absolutely necessary; but when they come to the Manner and Form of the Union, their weak Noddles are perfectly distracted."⁹ The diagnosis was right. If everybody's noddle had been as sound as Franklin's, much future trouble might have been avoided.

A supplement to Franklin's Plan should be mentioned at this point. It is found in the Massachusetts Plan of 1754, sometimes called Hutchinson's Plan.¹⁰ It was drawn up by a committee of the Massachusetts Assembly after that Assembly had rejected the Albany Plan. This plan proposes further means for carrying out the self-sustaining idea proposed by Franklin. Aside from the federal treasurer in each colony there are to be federal collectors to collect the taxes levied by the Grand Council. More important still the colonial courts are charged with the duty of sustaining federal laws. To quote from the plan: "And all laws and orders for enforcing the payment thereof [i. e., of federal taxes] in any and every colony . . . shall be as fully and effectively observed and executed as if they had been the laws of that particular colony where any offence shall be committed, and all offences against such laws and orders shall be tried and determined accordingly."

This is not far removed from the Constitution of 1787. Here federal law is placed on a par with state laws. There it was made supreme over state laws. Here the state courts are placed at the disposal of federal law. There a system of federal courts is created to perform the same function. The Massachusetts idea of 1754 was at least an initial step toward supplying a court system to uphold federal law.

The basic contribution is, however, embodied in the Albany plan, suggested by Franklin. The significance of this plan is that a type of federal government is proposed, new in the history of the world,—a government resting not upon the component states, but upon the individual citizens of those states. It was to be a self-sustaining federation.

In all of the preceding plans the money and men for war were to be raised by quotas assigned to each colony. Whether the

⁹Smyth (ed.), *Writings of Franklin*, 3: 242.

¹⁰For the text of the Massachusetts Plan see Carson, as cited above.

quotas were honored or not depended upon the caprice of the several legislatures. That Franklin was consciously trying to obviate this difficulty is shown by a statement in his "Short Hints," drawn up just prior to the Albany Congress. After outlining his proposed taxes on luxuries he says: "All of which would pay in some proportion to the present wealth of each colony, and increase as that wealth increases, and prevent disputes about the inequality of quotas."

The prior plans of union had not been put into operation except in the case of the New England Confederation. In that case it resulted in nullification as soon as a strong colony objected to a decision of the central council.

Yet the quota method had had a still wider trial. It was essentially the method of the British imperial system in America, and the recalcitrance of various colonies, especially Pennsylvania, in times of common danger, showed the utter futility of such a system. When England tried to remedy the system after the French and Indian War¹¹ she turned her face toward a self-sustaining *empire* similar to the self-sustaining *union* proposed by Franklin in 1754. The stamp tax and the Townshend taxes, however, raised such a storm of opposition in the colonies that the English government soon receded from them as practical expedients, preserving in the tea tax only a shred of the idea in order to maintain the legal right of taxing the colonies.

Moreover, the wrathful opposition of the colonies to the idea of a self-sustaining empire led them also away from the idea of a self-sustaining union. Consequently the year 1754 marks a high tide in the history of American political theory. In that year the idea of a centralized American union was at its peak. Subsequently there is a recession. Particularism had its flow-tide. The colonists, jealous of the powers of the British government, became fearful of any central government with power to sustain and perpetuate itself. So it was that the Articles of Confederation went back to the old quota system. Congress was given power (Article IX) "to agree upon the number of land forces, and to make requisitions from each State for its quota." As to taxes (Art. VIII), it was provided that they should "be laid and levied by

¹¹In the earlier period "Parliament had regulated trade; it had not taxed." For a clear distinction of the two powers see McLaughlin, in *Amer. Political Science Review*, 12 (1918): 227.

the authority and direction of the Legislatures of the several States." Of course such a government was not self-sustaining, in spite of the solemn pledge given by the several states when they adopted the Articles. To comprehend the failure of the quota system in this period it is enough to remind ourselves that during the years 1782-1783 Congress asked the states for \$10,000,000, and by the end of the latter year had received a total of only \$1,500,000; and during the whole period of the Confederation, 1781-1789, not half enough was paid in to cover the overhead of government on the most economical peace footing. In the meantime, indebtedness piled up to overwhelming proportions.

The significance of this colossal failure in the light of the present study is that some leaders of political thought turned at once to the idea of a self-sustaining union. As early as 1781, indeed a month before the Articles of Confederation came into effect, the old Continental Congress asked the states for power to levy a five per cent import duty to apply on war debts. Rhode Island blocked the move. In 1783 Congress again pleaded with the states for an "impost" to apply on the debts and save the young nation from bankruptcy. "Oh my country," cried Jeremiah Belknap, of New Hampshire, "to what an alarming situation are we reduced, that Congress must say to us, as Joshua did to Israel, 'Behold, I set before you life and death' . . . We must be drove to our duty, and be taught by briars and thorns, as Gideon taught the men of Succoth."

This second proposal for an impost was debated until 1787 and finally, when on the verge of adoption, was defeated in the legislature of New York,—“strangled by a band of mutes” as Hamilton raged when the opposition refused to debate the question.

One other man in this period should be mentioned because he seemed to see clearly the need for a self-sustaining union. Pelatiah Webster, of Philadelphia, in a pamphlet published in 1783, insisted that the central government of an effective union “must . . . of necessity be vested with power of taxation. I know,” he said, “this is a most important and weighty truth, a dreadful engine of oppression, tyranny, and injury, when ill used; yet from the necessity of the case it must be admitted . . . To make all . . . payments dependent on the votes of thirteen popular assemblies, who will undertake to judge of the propriety of every contract and every occasion of money, whilst at the same

time the operations of the whole may be stopped by the vote of a single one of them, is absurd."¹²

The sequel of the whole story is of course written large in the minds of all students of American history. The Convention of 1787 established a self-sustaining federal government vested with the power to make tax-laws and other laws operative directly upon the individual citizens of the country.

That the proposals of Franklin in 1754 or Pelatiah Webster in 1783 had any bearing upon the final result is unlikely, or at least problematical. Franklin apparently went along with the tide of particularism that set in after 1760. He did not renew his suggestion for a self-sustaining union when he discussed the Articles of Confederation in the Continental Congress. Moreover, as noted above, the Continental Congress was already turning its eyes toward the taxing power two years before Pelatiah Webster published his pamphlet.

It is enough for the historian to state the facts. It is enough glory for Franklin that he did work out a plan for a self-sustaining union, thirty-five years before such a union actually came into effect. In the interval, in spite of the reaction toward particularism, Franklin's countrymen, and he along with them, were pushed by the relentless hand of circumstance straight along the path that he early marked out.

For some years it has been contended by the present writer that the value of Franklin's proposal of 1754 has not been adequately recognized by historians. It was therefore some satisfaction to discover recently that contemporaries of Franklin had not entirely overlooked the facts. While the new Constitution was being discussed in 1788 an anonymous writer from New York sent a copy of the Albany Plan of Union to be printed in the *American Museum* of Philadelphia. With it he sent the following letter dated October 28, 1788:

Sir: As I am one of the numerous admirers of your valuable museum, I beg leave to suggest an important production of Dr. Franklin's to your notice—which ought to be wrested from obscurity—and deserves a place in

¹²Text of Pelatiah Webster's proposals in Hannis Taylor, *Origin and Growth of American Constitution*, 527 ff. The exaggerated claims for Webster's contribution have been thoroughly refuted.—See *Nation* (N. Y.), 93 (1911): 623-625; *same*, 94 (1912): 562-563.

your museum. I mean a plan of government for America, promulgated at Albany in 1754. I am surprised it has been dormant and unnoticed among all the publications on the subject of the new government. As the outlines of the plan bear so strong a resemblance to the present system, it will not only prove extremely interesting, but will tend to convince the wavering, that the new constitution is not the fabrication of the moment, but urged upwards of thirty years ago by that great man—even when we were subordinate to a superior head. May we not then reasonably suppose he never lost sight of his favorite system, till, in the end of his life, he has lived to see it accomplished?

I am, etc.,

A True Patriot and Federalist.

It was not the purpose of this paper to throw all the weight of emphasis upon the Albany Plan of Union. That plan was the greatest of them all, but it was only the culmination of many. Several of them contributed distinct ideas that were later embodied in the Constitution of 1787. The general concept of union goes back to its first practical expression in the New England Confederation of 1643. William Penn enlarged the idea by suggesting in 1697 a union of all the colonies. A Virginian in 1701 urged the scheme of proportional representation in the central assembly. Daniel Coxe, in 1722, would assign the veto power to the chief executive. Benjamin Franklin, in 1754, capped the whole structure by suggesting a federal government made self-sustaining through the taxing power. All of these features were at last embodied in the federal Constitution.

As indicated above, there is no desire to prove or even to intimate in this paper that these early plans of union played directly into the later Constitution. Such a thing is unlikely, and certainly it is unprovable. The elements of the Constitution came from many sources: from the practice of colonial legislatures, from the English Parliament, from the British imperial system, from rational reaction to the conditions of the time. A more reasonable generalization concerning the various plans of union is that similar circumstances bred similar ideas. In times of great emergency penetrating minds were feeling in the general direction of the ultimate solution.

It is of sufficient interest, and may I say, inspiration, to realize that in the earliest periods of American history the forces of nationalism were gaining on the forces of particularism, that plans of union were being evolved to meet the actual need for union. That thesis can be applied to American history down to our own day, and to the larger movement towards international cooperation in recent times. It is not a little heartening to rise from a study of even a small segment of history with a deepened conviction that the ultimate forces in human society are conjunctive rather than disjunctive, and that "the thoughts of men are widened by the process of the suns."

WILMINGTON MEETING

December 1-2, 1922.

TOWER HILL SCHOOL, WILMINGTON, DELAWARE.

Saturday Morning, December 2, 1922, at eight o'clock. CONFERENCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE ASSOCIATION.

Saturday Morning, December 2, 1922, at ten o'clock. MORNING SESSION.

THE NEW CONSTITUTIONS OF EUROPE¹

BY PROFESSOR LINDSAY ROGERS

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

The study of constitutions is one in political anatomy rather than physiology for constitutions are at best only the skeletons of the bodies politic. It may seem that political physiology is more important than political anatomy; that how governments work is more vital than their formal organization. To carry the illustration a step farther, political pathology is not without interest: what are the diseases that bodies politic now seem to be suffering from, and what remedies shall be applied? But before these alluring inquiries can be attempted, some attention must be paid to constitutional skeletons, for they determine the height, the solidity, and something concerning the shape, general contour and functional possibilities of the bodies they support. Living bones are of importance, not only in respect of their articulation to one another, but also in respect of the motive forces that govern their activities. The materials for such a study are now more numerous than ever before, and the remodelled political institutions of Europe are interesting not only in themselves but in the opportunity that they offer for a comparative reëxamination of devices that are working more or less successfully in the United States and Western Europe.

During the War four great empires crumbled and a fifth was profoundly affected. Poland, Esthonia, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Finland, and Danzig have all adopted written instruments

¹This is an abstract of Professor Rogers' address which was delivered extemporaneously. The abstract in some cases quotes from without giving specific credit to *The New Constitutions of Europe*, a volume prepared by Professor Rogers in collaboration with Professor Howard Lee McBain, of Columbia University, and recently published by Doubleday, Page & Co.

of government with some markedly democratic features. Germany and the German states abandoned the monarchical principle (John II of Liechtenstein is the only Prince remaining in Central Europe). Hungary continues her old form of government (without a King, however, for the present); and Jugoslavia (the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes), although a constitutional monarchy, has adopted a very liberal constitution. In Russia, apart from the economic philosophy of communism, the soviet principle of government is, as Lord Bryce has said, "ingenious and interesting as a novel form of constitution" and "deserves to be studied, apart from any doctrines, on its own merits." In Asia, four new states will attempt republican governments—the Far Eastern Republic, Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan, the last named being particularly interesting as marking the first democratic experiment in a Mussulman country.

A century ago there was in the old world only one spot in which the working of democracy could be studied. In 1914 there were five republics. Within a few months the number had been trebled. It has been a remarkable period of constitution drafting. That so many peoples unaccustomed to self-government should thus accept the democratic principle is a genuine tribute to that principle. It is none the less a danger. It will subject republican government to a terrific strain. This will not be any the less so because of the more socialistic schemes of distributive justice which the new democracies are attempting to evolve.

The crumbling of the Empires was so complete that in most of the new states the "founding fathers" were at liberty to fashion their governmental arrangements as they wished. They could borrow and adapt from the written constitutions of the world; they could even improvise out of hand. Four different forms of government were available for this borrowing. There was, first of all, the English cabinet system with the cabinet retaining office so long as it kept the confidence of the House of Commons, and with the equilibrium preserved by the ministerial prerogative of dissolving the legislature. In the second place, there was the rigid system of a separation of powers, best illustrated by the United States, under which the Administration has no responsibility to the Chambers. Thirdly, there was the Swiss collegial executive, elected by the Federal Assembly but not responsible to it. And there was, finally, the German parliamentary system, with a cabinet responsible not to the legislature but to the mon-

arch who both reigned and governed. France, it may be said, finds herself midway between the British and Swiss systems. The ministry is responsible but has no unrestricted power of dissolution; and the ability of the legislature to have its way makes the French system more nearly assimilable to that of Switzerland.

The relative borrowings of the new states from the four types of government are significant. The rigid system of the United States had no attractions. France and Belgium are the models that are chiefly followed, but perhaps most interesting of all is the arrangement in Esthonia and some of the German states. The ceremonial executive is dispensed with and the Swiss collegial executive is the model that is most closely followed, with the important difference that it is responsible to the legislature.

Cabinet responsibility, indeed, is to be found in all the new schemes of government. The presidential system of the United States did not appeal to the framers of the new constitutions. They desired the terms of their executives and legislatures to be subject to public opinion rather than determined by the calendar. They sought to avoid the extreme of England, where the cabinet dictates to the Commons and by holding the threat of dissolution over its head makes it subservient to the executive. They sought also to avoid the extreme of France where, without the necessary complementary power of dissolution, the executive is subject to the caprice of the chambers. Indeed in France, the executive is able to govern only when Parliament is not in session, for the legislature administers as well as makes laws.

All of the new constitutions, in the second place, refuse to accept an undiluted bicameral theory of an upper chamber which has an absolute veto on the acts of the lower chamber. Only Finland, Esthonia, and Jugoslavia have been bold enough to dispense with the time-honored check of an upper and usually less popular legislative body, but in all of the states the second chamber may be called secondary. Its veto is purely suspensive, and it is made so by an interesting adaptation of the theory of the Parliament Act of 1911 which limited the powers of the House of Lords. That Act took away the powers of the Lords over money bills and made it possible for the House of Commons, by repassing measures which were disapproved by the Lords, to get a law on the statute book after two years without the sanction of the upper chamber. The new constitutions substitute a special majority in the lower house for the delay of two years in the Parliament

Act. The provision of the German Constitution may be cited as typical. If the Reichsrat fails to approve a law passed by the Reichstag, it is voted on by the Reichstag again and if approved by a two thirds vote it is overruled. Only in the United States and Australia are there second chambers whose powers have not been limited by constitutional law or custom. The bicameral theory has been materially attenuated in the new instruments of government; the idea of a second chamber able to withstand the lower, has found little favor. Every effort has been made to avoid the evils indicated in Benjamin Franklin's description of a bicameral legislature: "It is a cart with a horse hitched to each end and both pulling in opposite directions." But how effectively the cart will be pulled and in what direction remains to be seen.

The third general point which deserves consideration in any outline of the new European experiments in Democracy is the attempt that has been made to have representation—always an arbitrary approximation—less arbitrary instead of more arbitrary. In this respect all of the constitutions agree. They provide for the application of the principle of proportional representation. Political parties will be given seats in the legislature according to their strength. It will not be possible, as happens in the United States and England, for a party with a minority of votes in the country to have control of the legislature. Proportional representation will mean a multiple party system, but the two party-system was on the decline before proportional representation was extensively resorted to.

The two-party system, however unreasonable and illogical it may be in some of its aspects, has unquestionable advantages over a multiple party system in point of simplicity, responsibility, and efficiency. It has been urged against proportional representation that it would tend to break up such a system. But to oppose proportional representation on such ground is to exalt expediency over principle. It is to admit that the two-party system perdures, not because the voters desire to divide into no more than two groups, but because they are offered no ready avenue of escape from such division. It is to confess that, contrary to all demagogic profession, the cohering agency of these groups is not so much common political opinions as it is something else—a combination no doubt, of tradition, system, of organization, of size, of legal status, of civic indifference, and above all, perhaps, of shrewdness on the part of party managers in not balking active

and widespread public opinion too boldly or too long, and in keeping the two parties somewhat apart on public questions, but not too far apart.

In the new Europe, also, experiments are to be made with functional representation. Occupational, interest, or class representation—by whatever name it is called—is fairly venerable. Survivals of it were to be found in a number of European upper chambers before 1918 and older and more conservative political theorists than the Guild Socialists and similar schools, have argued for it as opposed to geographical representation. Germany has made the first step in the direction of a new kind of representation. Article 165 of the new German constitution marks an important landmark in modern constitutional development. It sets up an Economic Council for the Reich, composed of representatives of employers and employees. "Before proposing drafts of politico-social and politico-economic bills of fundamental importance," the Ministry must submit such bills to this Council; and the Council itself may propose bills and may submit them to and defend them in the Reichstag even over the protest of the Ministry. An economic parliament, a chamber constituted on the basis of functional representation, is vested with the power to initiate and the right to be consulted upon social and economic legislation. As yet the experiment has not been tried long enough to warrant any generalizations as to its actual or probable success; but it is important not only in itself but in illustrating a tendency which is discernible in other countries. The Sankey Coal Commission in England; President Wilson's two industrial conferences, and President Harding's unemployment conference, inconclusive and extra-constitutional as they were, were all semi-functional bodies.

The fourth and last point to which attention should be called discloses another difference between the European constitutions and the American instrument of government. The new constitutions all contain elaborate bills of rights, but what is given with one hand is taken away by the other. "Freedom of press shall be assured—unless otherwise limited by law." "Private property shall not be taken for public use without the payment of compensation—unless otherwise determined by law." The constitutional guarantees are hortatory rather than mandatory. The American doctrine of judicial review found scant support in the constitutional conventions. Courts are set up and are empowered to declare ordinances unconstitutional because they are *ultra*

vires; so also in federal systems they may determine conflicts between the national and state authorities. But the power of the judiciary over national legislation is limited; and indeed, if it were not, there could be only a suspensive brake on the wishes of the democracy, for the constitutions can all be amended with little difficulty.

The new states of Europe are putting their trust in parliamentary institutions at a time when those institutions are being put to new tests. The huge engine of the Press, the decline of parliamentary ability, the vast extensions of the suffrage, the increase of executive power, direct action by labor, extra-constitutional organizations of various kinds—all these have great influence on the workings of constitutional government. Moreover, although the line that could formerly be drawn between economics and politics is becoming blurred and indistinct, nevertheless, to the extent that the distinction obtains, emphasis in the new states must of necessity be laid upon economics rather than politics. Political institutions as we now have them were developed in the nineteenth century to deal with problems which were primarily political. The prestige of the House of Commons, for example, derives very largely from the fact that it was the agency through which political rights were secured. Today the chief problems are in the economic sphere. The new states—and to a lesser degree the old states—are searching for new canons of distributive justice; for money to pay for extensive schemes of social amelioration, and are interested in the nationalization of the land and public utilities. Economic equality is different from political equality and it will be interesting to see whether cabinets and parliaments, elected on geographical lines, are competent to deal with the new problems. Lord Morley once remarked pessimistically that although over three hundred constitutions had been promulgated in Europe between 1800 and 1880 men had been very slow “in discovering that the forms of government are much less important than the forces behind them. Forms are only important as they leave liberty and law to awaken and control the energies of the individual man, while at the same time giving its best chance to the common good.” It is with this “common good” that the new states are chiefly concerned, and at the moment, “common good” may almost be written “common goods.”

POLITICAL LEADERS OF PRESENT DAY EUROPE

BY PROFESSOR WILLIAM E. LINGELBACH,

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

In venturing to speak on a subject so biographical in its nature, I am not unaware of the opinion of many that the individual in history counts for little or nothing. There are writers with whom history is like physics, merely a record of necessary changes and movements. In their opinion, great leaders — prophets and saints, poets and warriors, heroes, sages and statesmen are mere pawns on the great chessboard of civilization. Economic determinists, these men spurn the idea of the human will as a factor in progress. Spiritual forces count for nothing with them. Indeed when one adds this fundamental objection to the many other difficulties that confront the student of contemporary biography there is ample reason to question whether any serious effort at a study of present day leaders is worth while.

Of course not every one agrees with the determinist interpretation of history, and after I got well started in my task I found a good deal of comfort in Carlyle. Being a Scotchman, Carlyle very naturally believed in the individual as the one potent factor in historical development. The Scot has neither coal nor iron, rich pastures nor green meadows. But he has men! The "Great Man theory" as it is called has many exponents among the Scotch. "Universal History, the history of what man has accomplished in this world," says Carlyle, "is at the bottom, the history of the great men who have worked here; all things which we see standing in this world are properly the outward material result,—the practical realization and embodiment, of thoughts that dwelt in the great men sent into the world."

Into the merits or demerits of the two viewpoints I do not wish to enter. Plainly the true interpretation of history is to be found midway between the two. Man is the product of heredity and environment, but heredity and environment are being constantly modified in turn by man. There are forces that are not mechanical:—spiritual forces, conceptions of right and wrong, of duty and justice which are not subject to its laws. In the spiritual realm the human will and the human intelligence prevail. In man alone the two great forces, the mechanical and

spiritual manifest themselves. The lives and activities of great leaders therefore form an important part of history. Scotland was right when she set herself the task of making up her deficiency in material resources by giving a superior training and discipline to her men. For after all is said and done, the greatest product of a nation is its statesmen.

The first problem of my subject after this *apologia* is to select the leaders. Popularity among contemporaries is apt to be a bad guide. On the other hand if one looks through the records of the past, the men who stood out conspicuously as leaders in their own generation are also for the most part the men that history has continued to keep there. Occasionally men relatively unknown to their own generation and their own time emerge and in the course of time are given a place among the great men of the ages. Christ was not known to Romans, Dante lived and died in exile, Pestalozzi journeyed to Paris to see Napoleon and was not even vouchsafed an interview.

Among the leaders of contemporary Europe, none stands out so conspicuously as Mr. Lloyd George. Like so many of the leaders of the present day, he has risen from very humble beginnings. It was a hard struggle against poverty, far removed from the culture and training usual in the lives of the English statesmen. Even when Lloyd George came to London, he shared his room in Grays Inn with a fellow countryman.

Whatever we may think of Lloyd George or his policies, there can be no question of his claim to leadership. The list of his achievements in Parliament marks a veritable revolution both in the economic and the political life of England. The Working Man's Compensation Act (1906), the Old Age Pension Act (1909), the National Insurance Act (1911) and more especially the budget of 1909 resulting in the Parliament Act of 1911 by which the whole system of English government was radically modified, are among his more important achievements before the war. During the war, first as Minister of Munitions, then as Prime Minister, he, more than any single individual saved the cause of the Allies. His admirers say he won the war! The critics of the Versailles Treaty say he lost the future.

The only premier of the war period who received a mandate from the people to carry on its reconstruction policy, he became also the foremost figure in the international politics of the post-war days. The importance of this is apparent. It reveals him to us in an

entirely new role, a role to which, in the opinion of many, he was not equal. The problems of reconstruction Lloyd George was called upon to solve far surpass in difficulty any that confronted British statesmen before him. Added to the inherent difficulty of the problems he had the handicap of the secret treaties made during the stress of the war period. These, together with the insurmountable obstacles in the way of European reconstruction made his task in recent years more and more impossible. Many of his old friends became luke warm while the criticism and attack from his enemies steadily increased in bitterness. "He lacks only a crown, a robe and a gilded chair," says the author of "The Mirrors of Downing Street" to outshine in visible picturesqueness, the great emperor. His achievement, when we consider what hung upon it, is greater than Napoleon's, the narrative of his origin is more romantic, his character is more complex. And yet who does not feel the greatness of Napoleon and who does not suspect the shallowness of Mr. Lloyd George." Clemenceau once said of him, "Mr. Lloyd George is the most ignorant man I have ever known"; to which an English Tory sarcastically added, "He knows how to read I am sure, but I am equally certain that he never does."

It is perhaps to be expected that English Toryism should find real greatness in the war lord of a century ago, while it vents its spleen on the social reformer of our day. As the successful leader of the destinies of the Empire for the most momentous years of its history Mr. Lloyd George may not be the intellectual peer of some of the Tory leaders who appeal to this author, but even more than was the case with Napoleon, his intuitions are remarkably sound. His instincts have rarely misled him in regard to social and economic problems. Unlike Gladstone, he is rarely guided by well defined principles or by clear-cut intellectual judgments. He is emotional and he has been an opportunist. On the other hand it is hardly fair to insist too much on these points for it was he who, as Chancellor of the Exchequer-not entirely an emotional job, enacted the most revolutionary budget proposal of the century. Nor should we forget that it was after all under his government that the way was blazed along which that most difficult of all British problems, the Irish question, is finding its solution.

In foreign affairs, Mr. Lloyd George has not evinced that moral earnestness which characterized his earlier work when he fought to

improve the lot of the great mass of his countrymen and was willing to be called "the cad of the cabinet" because he stood for five shillings a week for their old age. But what moral enthusiasm could withstand the corroding effect of European diplomacy in the most deceptive and shifty period of all its hypocritical activity? His foreign policy was violently attacked by the Tories as feeble and aimless. Labor criticized it as economically unsound. In general he has gone back on his extreme program of "hang the Kaiser" and has urged upon France a reasonable reparations policy in place of the extreme program of the Nationalists.

Mr. Bonar Law is a man of very different type. In contrast to the little Welshman with big head and broad shoulders he is above medium height, straight, and well set up. In him the English Conservative party seems again to have found a safe though alien leader. Like Disraeli and Chamberlain he is not really of the party by tradition, though he is so by nature and disposition. A Canadian from New Brunswick, he elected to become a Scotchman, believing no doubt that as a Scot his chance of political success would be greater! The Scots have a habit of ruling other nationalities. Who is not familiar with the long line of Scotch names in the list of England's foremost men, both at home and in the colonies. I recently came upon a little volume on England by an anonymous author protesting bitterly against the excessive influence of the "Border" in English public life. The real Englishman is, he declares, too lethargic, and so the more energetic Celt from the fringe dominates and rules over him. Somehow the fringe, if we understand by that the small nationalities, seems to have furnished an undue proportion of great leaders.

The quality of Mr. Bonar Law that stands out conspicuously in all his work is his strong practical sense. He is not an orator even to the degree that Mr. Lloyd George may be termed one. But he is an extremely logical and persuasive speaker. When he has done with the little notes and statistics which he always draws from his waistcoat pocket, his auditors have usually come a long way towards his way of thinking. Of course, he represents the conservatives, but I cannot agree with Colonel Wedgewood that like all Bourbons, his face is turned toward the past. Instead, like earlier non-Tory leaders of the Tories, he is the only man who can lead them into the path of progress in this crisis.

Whenever I have heard Mr. Bonar Law, I have been impressed with his matter of fact way of getting at the heart of problems. He is not afraid to call a spade a spade. On August 3, 1914, after Mr. Asquith had made his eloquent statement of why Britain entered the war, and everybody in the House was in the highest pitch of patriotic fervor, this cool-headed, prosaic Scotchman drew attention to the fact that England would get Germany's trade. The incident had a further interest in the fact that Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, recently chosen to lead the Labor party now for the first time in the front Opposition benches, protested at the materialism of Mr. Law's speech. The moment when the nation and the world were face to face with untold sacrifice of life and liberty was not, he declared, the time to speak of trade. "Besides", he added prophetically, "if we can separate the German people from their militaristic leaders, the war will soon be over, on the other hand, if we can't then we shall be a long time licking them."

Mr. Ramsay MacDonald's opposition to the war and his pacifist views are well known. His selection as its standard bearer by the Labor Party at this time is an extraordinary challenge not only to the extremist but to thousands of more moderate views. Like the other English leaders discussed, he too is of the fringe and for the present Parliament, at least, Scot will be pitted against Scot.

The three outstanding political leaders of France of our period are undoubtedly Georges Clemenceau, Aristides Briand, and Raymond Poincaré.

Of the popular hero, the French "Tiger" at this moment the guest of the American people, I need say very little. His career is more widely known to Americans than that of any other living Frenchman. Born at Nantes eighty-one years ago, the son of a country doctor, this remarkable old man, Ulysses-like, felt himself driven by his indomitable spirit to leave the quiet of his home by the sea to bring the message of France to the people of America. I am aware that the message he brings is an intensely nationalistic one, but that was to be expected. He could not be himself and plead any other cause. Nor could he, unless he changed his nature, avoid at times being militaristic and imperialistic, despite his repeated disclaimers. But these are lapses that can be excused in a statesman of his years speaking without notes on the cause he has so much at heart. The intensity of his conviction and earnestness sometimes make the wish father to the fact. Strongly republican from his youth, he attracted the

hostility of the second Napoleon, and was thrown into prison by him in 1861. In 1864 his name was struck from the list of students at the University Medical School and he came to America where he remained for four years, teaching French and riding. While here he married an American wife by whom he had several children but who afterward divorced him.

After his return to France in 1868, he became the close friend of Gambetta, the bitterest enemy of Napoleon III, and after the Franco-Prussian war, the apostle of "La Revanche". Both were intensely nationalistic, republican and anti-clerical. In 1906, he became premier and at once his strong personality made itself felt. For three years he dominated the government; his ministry was acclaimed the strongest France had had since 1871. His contribution to the resistance to the Central powers in the war, his extraordinary achievements at the Peace Conference, are matters of recent history. On the other hand, it is not so well known that besides being a great statesman M. Clemenceau is also a journalist, an artist and a literary man of considerable reputation.

Very different in personality and in his policies is Aristides Briand, six times premier of France and leader of the moderate bloc in The Chamber of Deputies. He began life as a working man. His impassioned speeches won for him the support of his fellow workers and it was as a leader of the socialist group that he rose to prominence. But with responsibility came moderation and Briand developed into a progressive republican with a strong respect for orderly development. In 1910, he even suppressed the Socialist Strike by summoning the strikers to the colors and then assigning the men to duty on the very roads they were embarrassing by their strike. "France first", was his slogan. He combines Gallic alertness and respect for the logic of a situation with patience and restraint rare in French political leaders.

His reconstruction policy has been conciliatory and strongly at variance with that of Premier Poincaré. This brought him into close sympathy with Lloyd George. Both men have a good sense of humor. Sherrill tells how during the war, the two men were passing by the statue of Strasbourg still draped in mourning. "I can never see that statue without an unspeakable sadness coming over me," said Lloyd George. Briand grasped his hand saying, "Be sure that when the war ends we will remove those sad draperies." Whereupon Lloyd George became thoughtful for a moment

and then remarked, "Perhaps, if some day after the war, I should see in Berlin a statue of the German left bank of the Rhine similarly draped in mourning, I would feel the same emotion." "Ah!" replied Briand, "learn to control your emotions, lest you should also come upon another draped statue in Berlin representing German colonies that the war had forced you to take from Germany—it would't do then to show too much distress!"

In Raymond Poincaré France has a man whose work places him in the front rank of her great leaders. By his enemies, he is called the Bismarck of the era. Born at Bar-le-Duc sixty-two years ago, he has from his childhood been face to face with the unfortunate conflict over Alsace-Lorraine. The son of an engineer of local prominence, he was educated in the best schools of Paris where he showed considerable literary ability. His verse attracted the attention of Hanotaux and Millerand who became his warm friends, giving him the nickname of "Prudence Poincaré."

Later he abandoned literature for the law and politics. He rose rapidly, becoming a deputy at twenty-eight, minister at thirty-two, and at thirty-eight, he was offered the premiership which he declined. Not until 1912 did he accept the post, holding it for one year, when he was elected President. In this capacity he did yeoman service for seven years despite the fact that before he took over the office the Presidency had been without power or influence. Early this year he again became premier and is today carrying on the policy of his country in a vigorous nationalistic direction. Before the war, he was an active propagandist for preparedness and by far the most influential Frenchman in the promotion of the Entente. On the occasion of his assumption of the premiership upon the fall of the Caillaux ministry in 1912, Isvolsky, the Russian ambassador at Paris, wrote; "Henceforth a strong personality will rule at the Quai d'Orsay, *un Homme sec et autoritaire*. He can be depended upon to work for Russia's interests." From the outset, he let it be understood both through his speeches and the press that the day of concessions to Germany had gone by. Delcassé, an extreme nationalist, replaced George Louis as ambassador at St. Petersburg. Other measures showed the same tendency.

Poincaré's policy on reparations is well known. Like Clemenceau he demands the rigorous enforcement of the Versailles treaties. After the armistice the French in a great fervor of patriotic enthusiasm elected to carry out the work of reconstruc-

tion in the devastated areas themselves. The necessary billions were raised on short term bonds subscribed for by the people, repayment being assured by the reparations claims against Germany. When payments by Germany were not made the government, already confronted by a staggering deficit found itself in a dilemma. For months Poincaré has struggled with the situation which threatens to bring on national bankruptcy. Face to face with this contingency he is inclining more and more to independence of action and the policy of collecting reparations by armed occupation of German industrial centres.

Reference has already been made to Masaryk, the popular president of Czecho-Slovakia. Thomas Garrigues Masaryk is seventy-two. He was an old man when the Great War, in which he was to play so important a role, broke out. Exiled from his country, this aged Mazzini sought refuge in England and there began the most powerful propagandist movement of the war. The ideal of independent nationalities among the western Slavs was not new in central Europe. Masaryk himself had been one of its leading champions. Now he undertook to proclaim it to the world; especially did he plead the cause of the Czech nation. Beginning in England he passed over to France, organizing his fellow refugees wherever he went. From France he went to Russia and thence across the Pacific to the United States, enacting a sort of modern Odyssey. In Siberia his influence aided greatly in the formation of the Bohemian Legion, whose heroic achievements were epic adventures worthy the pen of a Xenophon.

When the war ended the exploits of the Czechs in Siberia and on other battle fronts, their manifest claims to independence coupled with the warm personal friendships Masaryk had established with the foremost men of the Paris Conference, were of inestimable aid to the cause of Czech nationality. Not only were Bohemia and Moravia consolidated into an independent nation but the welfare of the new state became a particular concern of the allied statesmen. The boundaries were very generously drawn in the interests of the new nation. Eighty per cent and more of the economic resources of the old Austria were included within the Czecho-Slovak frontier. As a result the new state is on a very strong economic basis despite its difficult geographic position.

Hard-headed, practical politicians are prone to look on Masaryk as a doctrinaire. It is true that he bears the academic stamp. He has spent his life in the class room and at his desk.

He has written over fifty books and pamphlets. But he has never lost sight of the practical end to be achieved. He has inspired thousands of young men and women. His thin, gaunt figure, his aesthetic face, stamp him as a scholar. But what of it! This scholar-statesman has studied and touched life as no so-called practical politician of his time has done. He is the son of a coachman, was successively a locksmith, a blacksmith, a schoolmaster, a journalist, a professor, a political detective, member of Parliament, a diplomatic agent and finally as president the foremost constructive statesman of the continent. The son of the people, Masaryk more nearly approaches Abraham Lincoln than does any other European leader of our time. His record is one of unselfish devotion to duty and to his ideals. He is conciliatory and tolerant even towards his old enemies; Germans and Austrians find him a friend. An eminent political leader of Vienna remarked to me, "Masaryk is one of the few who see beyond the narrow nationalism which is at present so rampant throughout Europe."

A unique feature of the constitution of Czecho-Slovakia is the fact that the President appoints the prime minister. As a consequence, Georges Benes, the pupil and intimate friend of Masaryk, holds that position. He also controls and directs the foreign policy. Still in the thirties he is a comparatively young man, but rarely in history has there been such thorough agreement and co-operation in the critical affairs of state as exists between Benes' and Masaryk. It is difficult to determine how much to attribute to the master and how much to the pupil, but under Benes' immediate direction Czecho-Slovakia has assumed the leadership of the new states of middle Europe and developed a farsighted constructive policy quite extraordinary in these days of the revival of the vicious old-time diplomacy. When the currents and cross currents of the complicated relations of a Balkanized middle Europe threatened to wreck the new states, Benes succeeded in forming the Little Entente. Through it he has succeeded in consolidating peace in a quarter of Europe that seemed more nearly on the brink of war than any other. More nationalistic than Masaryk he has nevertheless adopted a policy of economic reciprocity that promises very well for the restoration of the European equilibrium.

Among Italians of prominence Sonino, Orlando, and even Nitti are solid, capable men who served their country well. In Giolitti

and Mussolini, however, Italy has developed leaders that are unique and original.

Giolitti is, according to Lloyd George—and he had opportunity to know—“the best of us all”. He is a veteran statesman of the old school, for like Clemenceau he was born in the early forties. For over twenty years with a brief exception during the first years of the war, he has been the most powerful man in Italy. Favoring a policy of neutrality in the great war he was swept aside by the wave of Nationalist sentiment, and Italy entered the war under the guidance and leadership of others. After the war, however, when the extremists threatened to carry the country into Bolshevism and anarchy, the aged statesman returned to power, brought about a settlement and restored law and order. His success was to a considerable degree due to the work and influence of a new organization, the Fascisti, whose leader has just now taken over the direction of Italian affairs in such a dramatic and unconstitutional manner.

Benito Mussolini is not one of those restful personalities that one can examine microscopically. Like the late Viscount Northcliffe he is a man of action. A little past forty, he has risen by sheer force of will and energy to the position of a popular dictator. For if, after the example of Napoleon, he were to ask the people by plébiscite to pass on his usurpation, he would undoubtedly receive their endorsement. Like his Corsican prototype he is a son of the people. According to report he is the son of a blacksmith. He has been successively a stonemason, a weaver, a railway porter, a fencer, a socialist agitator, an editor, and a soldier of the Alpini. He is fond of music and plays the violin. To this record he has now added the founding of the Fascisti and the usurpation of the premiership. He began as a Socialist. His incendiary sheet “*L'Avvenire del Lavoratore*” (the Future of the Working Man) and “*La Lotta-di Classe*” reveal him as an extreme radical. A few years before the world war, however, he began to turn his attention to Italy's irredentest question and became an ardent nationalist. As such he did all in his power to bring Italy into the war. The war made him more nationalistic still, and at its close he threw himself with fervour into the struggle against the extreme Socialists who threatened by their strikes, and the seizing of factories, to undo the gains of the war and repeat in Italy the tragic experiences of Russia. To combat the movement he organized his citizen army

and developed a powerful propaganda appealing with great success to the disbanded soldiers and the lower middle class.

The Fascisti—the name taken from *fasces*, the bundle of sticks carried in front of the Roman officials as symbols of authority—grew in numbers till there were many hundreds of thousands well organized and led by retired officers. The movement captivated public opinion and carried its leader to the extraordinary coup d'état. Parliament timorously accepted it and Mussolini has organized a cabinet in which all parties, save the Socialists, are represented. Unfortunately he is carrying on in the same high handed manner now that he is in power. Newspapers are seized and suppressed, notably the widely read "Corriere della Sera" of Milan, opposition put down and a militant nationalism fomented. Plainly there is with Mussolini none of that fine "international mindedness" of Masaryk. Nor is there any sense of the dangers to liberty and democracy that may arise from a dictatorship imposed by force and without the sanction of parliament. It is a dangerous example to which Bolsheviks may well point if the opportunity to establish the domination of force on their part should ever present itself.

Time does not permit the discussion of the leaders of the Central Powers, if indeed they can be designated as leaders. As yet the post war period, and that means German democracy, seems not to have produced real leaders. Ebert, the sadler president of the German republic, is as colorless as his office. On the other hand Chancellor Wirth, who has just been forced to resign by the defection of his Socialist supporters, developed into a fairly strong, well-balanced statesman. Like Masaryk and Benes he is a college professor and his administration at first reflected the academician. With experience, however, he became more practical, winning the support and goodwill of all the moderates. His maintenance of the balance between the monarchists on the one hand and the extreme radicals on the other was no small achievement. In the burning question of reparations he started out apparently with a sincere purpose to meet the obligations imposed by the London Conference. But he found it impossible. The amounts were excessive German financial interests were unwilling and the payments could not be made. Inflation set in and the mark rapidly followed the downward course of the Austrian krone.

Whether the new Chancellor, Herr Cuno, can cope with the enormous difficulties of the task remains to be seen. He has

started out well by bringing together a strong business cabinet of a non-partisan character. As the director-general of the Hamburg American Line, he is naturally impressed with the business phases of problems of present-day Germany.

The leader of the Austrian government is Dr. Seipel, a Franciscan monk. He represents that powerful movement in central Europe which finds expression in the platform and activities of the Christian Socialist Party. Space prevents discussion of his work. Nor can I make more than a passing reference to Pashitch, the venerable white bearded statesman of Jugo-Slavia, Ionescu of Roumania, to Stambulski, the Bulgarian premier to Venezelos of Greece, to Mustapha Kemal Pasha, and last but not least to Lenine and his Bolshevik comrades.

By way of conclusion it may be noted that in these critical years of Europe her political leaders come mainly from the masses, not from the aristocracy nor even from the wealthier middle class. Lloyd George, Masaryk, Benes, Mussolini, Ebert, Wirth, Stambulski and others come from the ranks of the common people. The only one in the group of leaders at present in power who hails from the titled aristocracy is Lenine. Whether for good or evil, democracy is in the ascendant in the old world. Its tasks and responsibilities are enormous and should be a challenge to America.

TREASURER'S REPORT FOR YEAR ENDING MAY 5, 1922

RECEIPTS

Balance cash on hand.....	\$255.26
Received from dues to date.....	172.10
Received for account of 1921 dinner.....	134.00
Received for account of 1922 dinner.....	3.00
Received for Bibliography.....	6.96
Received for Proceedings.....	.50
Received for Omnibus hire 1921 meeting.....	36.00
TOTAL RECEIPTS.....	\$607.82

DISBURSEMENTS

Expenses of Spring Meeting, 1921.	
Expenses for dinner.....	\$183.00
Stenographer.....	12.00
Postage and clerical help.....	23.00
Omnibus hire.....	35.00
Bills, postal cards and programs.....	36.00
Expenses of speaker.....	12.61
Printing Proceedings, Westbrook Printing Co.....	210.20
Envelopes for Proceedings.....	6.00
Postage for Proceedings.....	11.10
Expenses of Spring Meeting, 1922.	
Printing Programs.....	18.00
Postage and envelopes.....	5.06
Stamps and envelopes for bills.....	8.10
Balance due on secretary's salary.....	18.50
TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS.....	\$578.57
Receipts.....	\$607.82
Disbursements.....	\$578.57
Balance on hand.....	\$29.25

NELLIE P. FERRY,
Treasurer.

CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I. *Name and Purpose*

This Association shall be known as the "Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland." Its purpose shall be two-fold: first, to advance the study and teaching of history and government through discussion and publication and, secondly, to promote personal acquaintance among teachers and students of history.

ARTICLE II. *Membership*

Any one interested in the study or teaching of history in the Middle States and Maryland shall be eligible to membership. Application for membership shall be accepted or rejected by a vote of the Council at its meeting next following the receipt of such application.

ARTICLE III. *Officers*

The officers shall be a president, a vice-president, a secretary (who shall also act as treasurer), and a council, consisting of the foregoing officers, two members elected by the Association, the ex-presidents of the Association, and one delegate from each local conference recognized by the Association. These officers, except the delegates and ex-presidents, shall be elected by ballot at each regular Spring meeting of the Association. In the Council shall be vested the general direction of the affairs of the Association.

ARTICLE IV. *Meetings*

The annual meetings of the Association shall be held at the time and place annually designated by the Council.

ARTICLE V. *Annual Dues*

The membership fee shall be \$1.00, payable at the time of the annual meeting.

ARTICLE VI. *Amendments*

This Constitution may be amended at any regular meeting by a two-thirds vote of those present, notice of the proposed amendment having been given at the call for the meeting.

ASSOCIATION OF HISTORY TEACHERS OF THE MIDDLE STATES AND MARYLAND

1921-1922

President

RAYNER W. KELSEY
HAVERFORD COLLEGE, HAVERFORD, PA.

Vice-President

J. MONTGOMERY GAMBRILL
TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Secretary-Treasurer

NELLIE P. FERRY
WEST PHILA. HIGH SCHOOL FOR GIRLS

1922-1923

President

J. MONTGOMERY GAMBRILL
TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Vice-President

HENRY R. BURCH
WEST PHILA. HIGH SCHOOL FOR BOYS

Secretary-Treasurer

LENA C. VAN BIBBER
MARYLAND STATE NORMAL SCHOOL, TOWSON, MD.

ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

FORMER PRESIDENTS

Lucy M. Salmon, Vassar College
C. M. Andrews, Yale University
J. H. Robinson, New School for Social Research
C. A. Herrick, Girard College
Eleanor L. Lord, Smith College
H. V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania
James Sullivan, State Historian, Albany, New York
Edgar Dawson, Hunter College
A. E. McKinley, Editor, Historical Outlook
Henry Johnson, Teachers College, Columbia University
John M. Vincent, Johns Hopkins University

Jessie C. Evans, Wm. Penn High School, Philadelphia
Marshall S. Brown, New York University
Livingston R. Schuyler, College of the City of New York
Daniel C. Knowlton, Lincoln School of Teachers College, New York City
Albert K. Heckel, Lafayette College, Easton, Penna.
Rayner W. Kelsey, Haverford College, Haverford, Penna.

ELECTED

John H. Logan, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.
Eleanor Parmenter, State Normal School, Trenton, N. J.

DELEGATES FROM CONFERENCES

Fred C. White, Morris High School, New York City
Leonora E. Carpenter, Eastern High School, Baltimore
Sarah A. Dynes, State Normal School, Trenton, N. J.
James C. Sigman, North East High School, Philadelphia

LIST OF MEMBERS

Note.—The arrangement in this list is: (1) name, (2) institution, (3) residence. The city or postoffice address is given only once if it is the same for both (2) and (3).

Adams, Charles E., Polytechnic Institute, Baltimore, Md.

Adams, Gladys, West Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa.

Adriance, Robert I., East Orange High School, East Orange, N. J.

178 N. Walnut St.,

Albert, Grace, Baldwin School, The College Inn, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

Alderfer, Clement J., Supervising Principal of Schools, Broad St.

Port Allegany, Pa.

Ale. Ida G., 412 Rutherford Ave., Trenton, N. J.

Allen, Freeman H., Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.

Allen, Joseph Dana, Headmaster, Polytechnic Preparatory Country Day School.

Brooklyn, N. Y. Dyker Heights,

Allison, William H., Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.

Ames, Herman Vandenburg. Dean of Graduate School, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Ammarell, Raymond Robert, Barringer High School, Newark, N. J.:

Andrew, L. Elizabeth, Junior High School, Baltimore, 3305 Windsor Mill Rd.

Andrews, Ada Mary, Junior High School, Baltimore, 3305 Windsor Mill Rd.

Andrews, Charles M., Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Andrews, Elizabeth A., Box 106, Merion Pa.

Arnoldson, Raoul, 3611 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.

Arthur, L. Louise, 350 W. 55th St., New York City.

Austin, G. B., 112 Cottage Ave., Mt. Vernon, N. Y.

Austin, Mrs. G. B., 112 Cottage Ave., Mt. Vernon, N. Y.

Bacon, Edna Lorine, East Side High School, Newark, N. J.

Bacon, Georgia F., 404 W. 115th St., New York City.

Bagley, Edith A., Kensington High School, Philadelphia, Pa. 1300 Spruce St.,

Baird, Mildred, So. Philadelphia High School for Girls, Drexel Hill, Pa.

Baldwin, Alice M., Baldwin School, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

Baldwin, James F., Vassar College, Poughkeepsie. N. Y. 269 Mill St.,

Bamberger, Florence Eilau, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

1029 Madison Ave.

Bamberger, Stella H., Junior High School, No. 49, Baltimore, Md.

1029 Madison Ave.

Barnard, James Lynn, State Dept. of Public Instruction, 2224 N. 5th St.,

Harrisburg, Pa.

Barnes, D. E., Morristown School, Morristown, N. J.

Barrick, Willina, Lincoln High School Jersey City, N. J. 2540 Boulevard,
 Bass, Bertha, 40 Irving Place, New York City.
 Bates, Abby Barstow, Morris High School, New York, City.
 Battles, Edith H., 143 Gregory Ave., Passaic, N. J.
 Beard, Charles A., New Milford, Conn.
 Beardslee, Sara E., 6077 Regent St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Beatman, A. S., Julia Richman High School, New York City, 60 W. 13th St.,
 Bechtel, Mary D., Bryn Mawr, Pa.
 Bedell, Irene M., Livingston, N. J.
 Belcher, Katherine E., Barrington High School, Newark, N. J.
 Bender, Major Peter, West Englewood, N. J.
 Bixler, F. S., Easton, Pa.
 Bowden, Witt, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Boyt, S. Ethel, West Philadelphia High School for Girls,
 Secane, Delaware Co., Pa.
 Bradshaw, Bessie E., High School, Cambridge, Md. 210 Oakley.
 Brady, Teresa Cecilia, 211 Carlton Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Brandenburg, Emily J., 110 Augusta Ave., Baltimore, Md.
 Brewer, Margaret H., Western High School, Washington, D. C.
 Bridgman, Ann T., 320 W. 83rd St., New York City.
 Briggs, Elizabeth, Horace Mann School, 509 W. 121st St., New York City,
 Brooks, Gertrude E., 162 Washington St., Phillipsburg, N. J.
 Brooks, Rebecca B., Eastern High School, Baltimore, Md., 2417 Calvert St.,
 Brown, J. Franklin, 64 Fifth Ave., New York City.
 Brown, Marshall Stewart, Dean of Faculties, New York University, New York
 City. 19 Fairview St., Yonkers, N. Y.
 Brown, Samuel H., Westtown School, Westtown, Pa.
 Brown, Stella E., School Supervisor; Board of Education, Frederick, Md.
 Bryan, Alfred C., High School of Commerce, New York City, 155 W. 65th St.,
 Buchanan, Mary F., Junior No. 1 School, Trenton, N. J., 439 Bellevue Ave.
 Buckle, Alice I., High School, Conshohocken, Pa. 134 E. Fourth Ave.
 Buckley, Margaret H., Falls Road, Baltimore, Md.
 Bunnell, Theora J., Sta. A. B. 195, Meriden, Conn.
 Burlingame, Anne Elizabeth, Hunter College, New York City.
 Butler, Arthur P., Morristown School, Morristown, N. J.
 Byrom, Reba, 501 Carpenter Lane, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Cairnes, Laura J., Western High School, Baltimore, Md. 4008 Roland Ave.
 Campbell, Elsie, 94 Western Ave., Morristown, N. J.
 Campbell, James O., Westminster College, New Wilmington, N. J.
 Capen, Louise I., High Bridge, N. J.
 Carman, Harry J., Columbia University, New York City.
 Carpenter, Leonora E., Eastern High School, Baltimore, Md.
 Carrigan, Kathryn E. C., High School, Atlantic City, N. J.
 Castle, E. H., East Bridgewater, Mass
 Chandor, Valentine L., Principal, Miss Chandor's School for Girls, 137 E. 62nd
 St., New York City,
 Cheyney, E. P., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Clark, Mary Emily, Principal, George Biddle High School, Cecilton, Md.

Clauder, Anna C., Wm. Penn High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa.
 2041 Ontario St.
 Cockram, Edith May, 35 Lincoln Ave., Trenton, N. J.
 Coffin, Mrs. Elizabeth F., 140 N. 15th St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Conner, Frances S., Scranton High School, Scranton, Pa.
 Conovitz, Michael, Central High School, Newark, N. J.
 Cooley, Charlotte Cecil, Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md.
 910 St. Paul St., Baltimore, Md.
 Cooper, Irma J., Girls High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 80 Addison Ave., Rutherford, N. J.
 Coulomb, Charles Augustin, District Superintendent of Schools, District No. 1.
 Philadelphia. 4249 Girard Ave.
 Crane, Ella E., 2015 Bedford Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Cunniffe, Katharine, Dean of Girls, Evander Childs High School, 2331 Grand
 Concourse, New York City.
 Curtis, A. Gertrude, Walnut Hills High School, Cincinnati, Ohio,
 2409 Ashland Ave.

 Darnell, Alice C., Woodstown, N. J.
 Dawson, Edgar, Hunter College, New York City.
 Day, Margaret, 3710 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Deck, Clara, Girls High School, Reading, Pa.
 Deshel, Morris Charles, DeWittClinton High School, New York City.
 503 McLean Ave., Yonkers, N. Y.
 Deyo, Alfred L., Friends Academy, Moorestown, N. J.,
 Dickinson, Florence, Bryant High School, 2454 Webb Ave., New York City.
 Dilks, Clara Gilbert, Philadelphia High School for Girls. 6126 Jefferson St.,
 West Philadelphia, Pa.
 Donovan, Lillian, 513 N. Carrollton Ave., Baltimore, Md.
 Dowd, Mary A., 505 S. Crouse Ave., Syracuse, N. Y.
 Downey, Margaret E., Junior High School No. 80. Md. Baltimore,
 1575 Abbottston St.,
 Duggan, Stephen P., 419 West 117th St., New York City.
 Dunaway, Wayland F., Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.
 702 W. College Ave.,
 Dwyer, Elsie M., 633 Valley Road, Montclair, N. J.
 Dynes, Sara A., State Normal School, Trenton, N. J. 605 Monmouth St.,

 Earle, Edward Mead, Columbia University, New York City.
 Earle, Elsie, Hunter College. 46 W. 58th St., New York City.
 Eaton, Margaret Clarke, William Penn High School, Philadelphia, Pa.
 1929 Mt. Vernon St.
 Eaton, Roland Leonard, 404 S. Broad St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Egan, J. J., Army & Navy Preparatory School, Washington, D. C.
 Ellery, Eloise, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
 Elliott, C. H., Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.
 Elliott, Rebecca P., William Penn High School, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Ely, Elizabeth L., Principal of Ely School, Greenwich, Conn.
 Evans, Jessie, William Penn High School, Philadelphia, Pa.

Fairchild, J. R., American Book Co., New York City.
 Farnsworth, Mildred A., 405 W. 118th St., New York City.
 Farnsworth, Nellie M., 405 W. 118th St., New York City.
 Farrell, Letitia, Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md., 76 Ship-
 wright St. Annapolis, Md.
 Ferry, Nellie P., West Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa.
 4510 Chestnut St.
 Ferris, Frederick L., The Peddie School, Hightstown, N. J.
 Fleming, Carrie O., Julia Richman High School, New York City, 450 E.
 26th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Foote, Anna Elizabeth, Training School for Teachers, New York City.
 The Franklin, Jamaica
 Ford, Grace Pascal, 14 W. 127th St., New York City.
 Foster, Erma M. 329 Warburton Ave., Yonkers, N. Y.
 Fox, Dixon Ryan, Columbia University, New York City.
 Fraser, Henry S., Cascadilla Park, Ithaca, N. Y.
 Frazier, H. S., Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.
 Freburger, Mary L., 539 N. Carrollton Ave., Baltimore, Md.
 Freeman, Sara H., Englewood High School, Englewood, N. J., 28 Hillside Ave.
 Frick, Mrs. W. H., St. Agatha School, 559 West End Ave., New York City.
 Galloway, Ida Gray, Washington Irving High School, 40 Irving Place, New
 York City.
 Gambrill, J. Montgomery, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York
 City, 548 Riverside Drive.
 Gardner, Elizabeth, Laurel High School, Laurel, Md.
 Gardner, Gertrude R., High School, Catskill, N. Y.
 Gaskill, Lois L., Polytechnic Preparatory County Day School, 92nd St. &
 7th Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Gerson, A. J., Department of Superintendence, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Gibbons, Alice Newman, East High School, 97 Ambrose St., Rochester, N. Y.
 Gibson, Achsah, 3631 Elm Ave., Baltimore, Md.
 Giltner, Emmett E., N. Y. Training School for Teachers, New York City, 231
 E. 237th St.
 Glocker, Mrs. Lelia F., Junior High School, Baltimore, Md., 2909 W.
 Presstman St.
 Goodman, Hannah, West Philadelphia High School for Girls,
 Philadelphia, Pa., 1306 S. 53rd St.
 Goshaw, Mildred, Frankford High School, Philadelphia, Pa.,
 428 Conarroe St., Roxborough, Pa.
 Gould, Clarence Pembroke, President of Washington College,
 Chestertown, Md.
 Grady, Eleanor H., Hunter College, New York City, 550 W. 140th St.
 Greenau, John T., 304 William St., East Orange, N. J.
 Green, Joseph C., Princeton University, 176 New Jersey. Western Way
 Greene, Garton S., Germantown High School, Philadelphia, Pa., Hillside.
 Greene, Louise Kossuth, Junior High School, Montclair, N.J., 73 Orange Road.
 Greer, Roxy R., Jamaica Training School, Jamaica, N. Y. 106 W. 13th St.,
 New York City.
 Griffin, John J., Hoboken High School, Hoboken, N. J.

Haasz, George Neiler, South Philadelphia High School for Boys,
 Philadelphia, Pa., 1733 N. 25th St.
 Haeseler, Ada H., William Penn High School, Philadelphia, Pa.
 1920 Shunk St.
 Haight, S. Carleton, 1764 Vyse Ave., New York City.
 Hall, P. G., 522 Pawnee St., S. Bethlehem, Pa.
 Hanaway, Roy Clark, Rutgers College, 27 Walter Ave., Highland Park.
 New Brunswick, N. J.
 Harley, Lewis R., Principal of Philadelphia High School for Girls,
 Philadelphia, Pa., 5224 Chestnut St.
 Harrison, Mary Ella, Western High School, Baltimore, Md.,
 1617 Eutaw Place.
 Hatch, R. W., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
 Hayes, Carleton J. H., Columbia University, New York City.
 Heal, Frank Martine, 419 E. 10th St., Wilmington, Del.
 Heath, Lucile, Monkton Road, Monkton, Md.
 Heckel, Albert K., Dean of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
 Heckles, Olive E., 151 Palisade Ave., W. Hoboken, N. J.
 Hedden, Elma W., State Normal School, Newark, N. J.
 Hedge, Louise June, 1453 Glenwood Road, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Hellwege, Alma M., 1960 N. 6th St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Hendley, C. J., 323 Main St., Paterson, N. J.
 Herrera, Lilian, 1222 W. Lafayette Ave., Baltimore, Md.
 Herrick, Cheesman Abiah, President of Girard College, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Hill, Mrs. Louise B., The Bennett School, Milbrook, N. Y.
 Hoblitzell, M. Nellie, Junior High School, Baltimore, Md., 1519 Park Ave.
 Hodgdon, Frederick Crosby, Ginn & Co., 70 Fifth Ave., New York City.
 Holben, Ralph P., Allentown High School, Allentown, Pa.
 218 N. St. Cloud St.
 Hollstein, Susie Harman, Western High School, Baltimore, Md.
 843 University Parkway.
 Holt, Lucius Hudson, Colonel U. S. Army, West Point, N. Y.
 Howe, Samuel B., South Side High School, Newark, N. J.
 Hull, Charles Henry, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
 Hull, William Isaac, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.
 Hunter, Lucy Beall, National Cathedral School, Washington, D. C.
 Isanogle, A. M., Western Maryland College, Westminster, Md.
 Johnson, Henry, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
 Johnson, Lloyd Wellington, Adelphi Academy, Brooklyn, N. Y.,
 150 St. James Place.
 Johnston, S. Edna, Walnut Lane School, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Jones, George J., Central High School, Washington, D. C.
 Jones, Theodore F., New York University, New York City.
 Jurket, F. A., Cedarville College, Cedarville, Ohio.
 Kaufmann, Rose, Kensington High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Kaye, P. Lewis, Baltimore City College, Baltimore, Md.
 Keck, Charles E., 8 E. 34th St., New York City.

Keep, Arthur B., College of City of New York, New York City.
 Kelley, Frank B., De Witt Clinton High School, New York City,
 455 Madison Ave., Elizabeth, N. J.
 Kelsey, Rayner W., Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.
 Kent, Clara B., High School, Annapolis, Md., 71 Shipwright St.
 Kenworthy, Beatrice, Y. W. C. A., Franklin St., Baltimore, Md.
 King, Florence B., Philadelphia Normal School, Philadelphia, Pa.,
 1301 Spring Garden St.
 Klinesmith, Bessie, Western High School, Baltimore, Md., Normandie Apts.
 Knapp, Annie May, Richmond Hill High School, Richmond Hill, N. Y.
 Knapp, Charles M., 437 Waverly Ave., Syracuse, N. Y.
 Knowlton, Daniel C., Lincoln School of Teachers College, New York City,
 97 N. Mountain Ave., Montclair, N. J.
 Kollock, Margaret R., West Philadelphia High School for Girls,
 Philadelphia, Pa.
 Kull, Irving Stoddard, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.,

 Lane, Mrs. Ina L. C., Poly. Prep. Country Day School, Brooklyn, N. Y.,
 896 Sterling Place.
 Latane, Edith, Mary Baldwin Seminary, Staunton., Va.
 Latane, John H., Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
 Lavers, Lida A., Central High School, Newark, N. J., 42 Kearny St.
 Lawrence, Antoinette, Jamaica High School, Hillside Ave., Jamaica, L. I.
 Leete, Gertrude, Richmond Hill High School, New York City.
 Lentz, E. Marie, 422 Willow Ave., Altoona, Pa.
 Lewis, Rose Wyeth, Washington High School, Ridgefield Park, N. J.
 Lincoln, Anna T., 508 W. 10th St., Wilmington, Del.
 Lingelbach, W. E., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.,
 Logan, J. H., Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.,
 Lord, Eleanor, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
 Loveland, Mrs. Gertrude H. W., Philadelphia High School for Girls,
 Philadelphia, Pa.
 Loveland, Helen S., 413 E. Lancaster Ave., St. David's, Pa.
 Lunt, W. E., Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.

 Mace, William Harrison, 1205 Harrison St., Syracuse, N. Y.
 Magoffin, Ralph V.D., Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
 MacGregor, Mary Isabel, Evander Childs High School, New York City.
 102 Mamaroneck Ave., White Plains, N. Y.
 MacLear, Anne Bush, Hunter College, New York City.
 118 Cottage Ave., Mount Vernon, N. Y.
 MacNeal, Ruth S., White Plains High School, 53 Mamaroneck Ave.
 White Plains, N. Y.
 Mallett, Metta F., 355 Hamilton Ave., Trenton, N. J.
 Martin, A. E., Pennsylvania State College, 17 Lib. Arts Bldg.,
 State College, Pa.
 Marty, Sara M., 37 Linden Ave., Irvington, N. J.
 McClellan, Effie G., 212 Pittston Ave., Scranton, Pa.

McCamant, Catharine, Pottsville High School, Pottsville, Pa.
1212 Howard Ave.

McClain, Miriam, West Philadelphia High School, Philadelphia, Pa.

McCelland, Effie G. 212 Pittson Ave., Scranton Pa.

McClelland, Mary A., 214 Jay St., Albany, N. Y.

McClosky, Mary L., Long Branch High School, 123 3rd Ave., Long
Branch, N. J.

McCreary, Gertrude R., 728 N. High St., Bethlehem, Pa.

McKinley, Albert E., The Historical Outlook and University of Pennsylvania,
Philadelphia, Pa.

McQueen, Alice Edgerton, Philadelphia High School for Girls,
Germantown, Pa. 6316 Sherman St.,

Mead, Nelson P., College of City of New York, 138 St & Convent Ave.
New York City.

Melchior, D. Montfort, Supervisor of High School Instruction, Girard College,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Melson, M. M., Commercial High School, Atlanta, Ga.

Merrill, George A., 253 Park St., Hackensack, N. J.

Mitchell, Pearl Boring, West Philadelphia High School for Girls,
Philadelphia, Pa., 5016 Locust St.

Mohair, Anna B., Central High School, Newark' N. J., 385 S. Belmont Ave.

Mohr, Walter Harrison, George School, Bucks County, Pa.

Moon, Parker T., Columbia University, New York City.

Moore, Emily E., North East, Md.

Morse, Livingston Burrill, College of City of New York, 400 W. 160th St.,
New York City.

Moyer, Fayette, DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City.

Munro, Dana C., Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

Munson, R. B., Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa.

Murray, Effingham C., Adelphi Academy, 1710 Cator Ave. Brooklyn, N. Y.

Murray, Lucy E., Western High School, Baltimore, Md.

Murray, Robert Cornelius, Riverdale Country School, 625 W. 113th St.
New York City.

Muzzey, David S., Columbia University, New York City, 492 Van Courtlandt
Park Avenue, Yonkers, New York.

Nelson, Mabel F., Teachers College, 70 Morningside Drive Apts. New York City

Nicholson, Caroline L., Westtown School, Westtown, Pa.

North, Mary, Montclair High School, 77 Orange Road, Montclair, N. J.

Northrop, Amanda C., Hunter College, 15 E. 28th St. New York City.

Noyes, H. H., McMillan Company, New York City.

O'Brian, Elizabeth M., 131 W. 6th St., Oswego, N. Y.

O'Brien, Mayme, Junior High School, Franklin, Pa., 412 Tenth St.

O'Conner, Mary N., 50 Spruce St., Newark, N. J.

Osgood, Ellen L., Julia Richman High School, New York City.
17 Myrtle Ave., Plainfield, N. J.

Ott, Mary Castle, Frederick High School, Frederick, Md., 323 N. Market St.

Ottman, W. H., 417 S. 51st St., Philadelphia, Pa.

Packard, Frederick Lucius, Montclair High School, Montclair, N. J.
50 Midland Ave.

Pahlow, Edward W., Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J.

Paine, Frederick Holmes, Eastern District High School, 185 Gates Ave.
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Park, Julian, University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N. Y.

Parmenter, Eleanor, Normal School, Trenton, N. J.

Patton, Mary P., 1439 University Ave., New York City.

Pearson, Henry C., Horace Mann School, New York City.

Peak, Beatrice, West Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa.

Phillips, J. C., West Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa.

Phinney, Mrs. Alexander S., The Knox School, Cooperstown, N. Y.

Pielert, Mrs. Mabel A., Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md.

Ping, Louise M., 1270 Carroll St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Pippin, Mrs. Elizabeth E., Caroline High School, Denton, Md.

Plate, Emma, Bayonne High School, Bayonne, N. J.
91 Van Reypen St., Jersey City, N. J.

Price, Blanche D., Germantown High School, Philadelphia, Pa.

Price, Joseph Haines, Germantown Friends School, Philadelphia, Pa.

Quinlan, Grace M., Maxwell Training School for Teachers, Park Place,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Raubenheimer, Otto, 1341 Fulton St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Ray, Russell L., 105 West 40th St., New York City.

Redmond, M. Lucy, 20 Madison St., Annapolis, Md.

Reese, Lillian B., Junior High School No. 79, Baltimore, Md.,
4103 Roland Ave.

Regina, Sister M., Principal, Holy Trinity School, 3513 N. St.,
Washington, D. C.

Renninger, Warren, Central High School, Philadelphia, Pa.,
Broad & Greene Sts.

Rex, Percival, Friends Central School, 15th & Race Sts. Philadelphia, Pa.

Rice, W. L., Boys High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Riordan, Josephine, 142 Charles St., Annapolis, Md.

Roberts, William Ely, West Philadelphia High School for Boys,
Philadelphia, Pa. Lansdowne, Delaware Co., Pa.

Robinson, James Harvey, 924 West End Ave., New York City.

Robinson, Mary L., 30th & Market Sts., Wilmington, Del.

Rogers, Emily M., Hillside Junior High School, Montclair, N. J., 38 Church St.

Rugg, Harold, Lincoln School, Teachers College, New York City.

Rust, M. Hazelwood, Box 82, Jenkintown, Pa.

Ryan, Sara T., 46 Atlantic St., Carteret, N. J.

Ryden, George Herbert, University of Delaware. Newark, Del., Box 334,

Sachs, Julius, 225 W. 86th St., New York City.

Salmon, Lucy M., Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

Sands, R. W., North East High School for Boys, Philadelphia, Pa.

Saurwalt, Alma Virginia, Philadelphia High School for Girls,
Philadelphia, Pa. 3730 N. 19th St.

Schapiro, J. Salwyn, College of the City of New York, New York City.

Schuyler, Mary Eloise, West Philadelphia High School for Girls,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Schulyer, Livingston R., College of City of New York, New York City.

Schweppe, Emma, Lincoln School of Teachers College, 541 W. 124th St.
New York City.

Scott, S. Spencer, 1 W. 47th St., New York City.

Sebring, Emma G., Principal of St. Agatha's School, 557 West End Ave.,
New York City.

Selby, Mary M., 1632 Ellamont St., Walbrook, Baltimore, Md.

Selden, Joseph P., Hoboken High School, Hoboken, N. J.

Selecter, Rachel, Kensington High School, Philadelphia, Pa.

Selmser, G. H., William Penn High School, Philadelphia, Pa.

Shaw, F. DeG., Hamilton Institute for Girls, 326 W. 90th St. New York City.

Shaw, Herman S., Haverford School, Haverford, Pa.

Shaughnessy, Margaret, 1433 Bolton St., Baltimore, Md.

Shepherd, William R., Columbia University, New York City.

Shiels, Albert, Teachers College, Columbia University. New York City,

Shipman, Henry R., Princeton University, New Jersey, 27 Mercer St.

Sigman, James M., North East High School, Philadelphia, Pa.

Simpson, Sarah A., 435 W. 123d St., New York City.

Sioussat, St. George Leakin, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Sisters of Mercy, Mt. St. Agnes College, Mt. Washington, Md.

Skinner, Avery Warner, State Dept. of Education, Albany, N. Y.

Smith, C. Alphonso, U. S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.

Smith, Edward Payson, State Dept. of Education, Albany, N. Y.

Snowden, Sarah W., Newburgh High School, Newburgh, N. Y.
238 Montgomery St.

Spence, Lydia E., Baltimore Teachers Training School, Baltimore, Md.
626 S. Paca St.

Spencer, Abraham Lincoln, Central High School, Philadelphia, Pa.

Steele, Esther C. M., The Baldwin School, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

Stevenson, Josephine, Long Branch High School, Long Branch, N. J.

Stewart, J. L., Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa.

Stewart, Mary Weldon, William Penn High School, Philadelphia, Pa.
1218 S. Broad St.

Stimson, Dorothy, Dean of Goucher College, Baltimore, Md.

Stone, Virginia E., State Normal School, Towson, Md.

Strong, Solomon C., West Orange High School, West Orange, N. J.
11 Overlook Ave.

Stryker, Florence E., State Normal School, Montclair, N. J.

Stutz, Rose C., Western High School, Washington, D. C.

Sullivan, James, State Historian, State Education Bldg., Albany, N. Y.

Sutch, Cleora, Scarsdale High School, Scarsdale, N. Y.

Swetland, Roger Williams, Headmaster of the Peddie School, Hightstown, N. J.

Swift, Annie Dean, Girard College, Philadelphia, Pa.

Swift, Mary Spedding, Germantown-Harmer School, Philadelphia, Pa.,
36 W. Graver's Lane, Chestnut Hill.

Swift, Lucy, Graver's Lane, Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, Pa.

Tall, Lida Lee, Principal of Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md.
 Tanner, Edwin P., Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.
 Taylor, Jane I., Wadleigh High School, 215 W. 114th St., New York City.
 Terry, Eva, 15 Franklin Place, Summit, N. J.
 Thallon, Ida Carleton, Vassar College, Poughkeepie, N. Y.
 Thompson, Eleanor, 2020 N. 21st St., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Thompson, James A., Durham School, Philadelphia, Pa., 669 Brooklyn St.,
 Thompson, Josephine, 96 Sterling Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Thompson, Mrs. M. Berna, William L. Dickinson High School, Jersey City, N. J.,
 445 Bergen St.
 Thompson, Mildred, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
 Thompson, Robert E., Central High School, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Townsend, Mary E., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City
 194 Riverside Drive.
 Trimble, Helen Bell, State Normal School, E. Stroudsburg, Pa.

Valentine, Katherine T., 216 Myrtle Ave., Baltimore, Md.
 Van Bibber, Lena C., Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md.
 129 E. North Ave., Baltimore, Md.
 Van Dyke, Paul, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
 Van Sant, Sarah, Junior High School No. 78, Baltimore, Md.
 1516 Harlem Ave.
 Van Vleck, George W., Polytechnic Prep. Country Day School, 92nd & 7th
 Aves., Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Verplank, Judith C., 31 E. 49th St., New York City.
 Vincent, John Martin, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Walter, Ella Catherine, Johnstown High School, Johnstown, Pa.
 520 Franklin St.
 Walther, E. Curt, Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md.
 Wanger, Ruth, Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa.
 1300 Pine St.
 Ware, Ralph B., Girard College, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Weedon, M. Ava, Junior High School, Baltimore, Md. 1306 W. Lexington St.,
 Weglein, David E., Asst. Supt. of Schools, 2400 Linden Ave. Baltimore, Md.
 Weidenhammer, Nettie, 213 S. Calhoun St., Baltimore, Md.
 Welch, Fannie Florence, Passaic High School, Passaic, N. J., 47 High St.
 Wellman, Henry G., High School, Atlantic City, N. J.
 Wells, Mary B., Hartridge School, Plainfield, N. J.
 Wells, Mrs. Laura C., 2121 W. Lexington St., Baltimore, Md.
 White, Fred C., Morris High School, New York City.
 Bronx Y. M. C. A., 470 E. 161st St.

Wiener, Katherine M., 109 E. Patrick St., Frederick, Md.
 Wilder, Charles Wesley, Headmaster of Arnold School, Pittsburgh, Pa.
 Wildes, Mrs. Helen J., William Penn High School, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Wildes, Harry E., North East High School, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Wildman, Catharine, Box 110, Langhorne, Pa.
 Wildman, Esther Theresa, 140 N. 15th St., Philadelphia, Pa.

Williams, Clarence Russell, 29 W. Walnut Lane, Germantown,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Williamson, Louise S., 613 Main St., Asbury Park, N. J.

Wilson, Ida Belle, 430 W. 118th St., Apt. 1, New York City.

Wilson, L. W., South Philadelphia High Sch. for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa.

Wing, Lucy Maderia, Headmistress of Miss Madeira's Sch., Care of Mrs. David L. Wing, 1330 19th St. Washington, D. C.

Winters, Herbert Daniel, Keuka College, Keuka Park, N. Y.

Wlodeck, Alwina H., 319 E. 204th St., New York City.

Wood, Elizabeth C., Wadleigh High School, 114th St. & 7th Ave.
New York City.

Wyckoff, Harriet Elvira, High School of Commerce, 512 W. 123rd St.,
New York City.

Wyman, Alice, Ruxton, Md.

Young, Helen Louise, Hunter College, New York City.

Zook, George F., U. S. Bureau of Education, Washington, D. C.

Note.—Effort has been made to obtain accurate and full information as to addresses and official positions of members. Cooperation in this matter is asked by the Secretary, who will be glad to have her attention called to any omissions or inaccuracies which may occur in the preceding list.

ARE YOU INTERESTED IN THE PROJECT-PROBLEM METHOD

of teaching History? This method is attracting widespread attention and is bringing about great changes in the conduct of class room instruction in history. It encourages creative activity on the part of the pupils and give sthem the opportunity to do something worth while.

Teachers of History in applying the project-problem method find difficulty in getting the necessary teaching materials for their classes. A well-organized body of aids for such instruction will be found in

McKINLEY'S ILLUSTRATED TOPICS FOR HISTORY CLASSES

These Topics contain references to outside reading, they furnish a specimen outline, and afford opportunity to embody the study of pictures, the use of maps, and the critical study of source-material. *They are absolutely unique* in their adaptability to the project-problem method.

Write to the publishers for sample copies of Topics for
Ancient, American and European history.

McKinley Publishing Company
PHILADELPHIA

*The eternal significance of the past as
determining the road we travel to-day*

FOR HIGH SCHOOLS

MUZZEY'S
An American History, Revised

The most popular textbook in its
field. Used wholly or in part in
49 of the 100 largest cities of the
United States.

FOR COLLEGES

MUZZEY'S
The United States of America

VOLUME I

(Through the Civil War)

Only six months old but adopted
in over 80 institutions of college
grade.

VOLUME II

(In Preparation)

GINN AND COMPANY

BOSTON
NEW YORK
ATLANTA
DALLAS

CHICAGO
COLUMBUS
LONDON
SAN FRANCISCO

**Recent and Forthcoming Texts
Which Will Undoubtedly be of Interest
To All History Teachers**

History of the United States

By Charles A. Beard and Mary Ritter Beard

Modern History

By Carlton J. H. Hayes and Parker T. Moon

Industrial History of the United States

By Louis R. Wells

The Practice of Citizenship

By Roscoe L. Ashley

***American Economic Life in its Civic and
Social Aspects***

By Henry Reed Burch

American Social Problems

Problems of American Democracy

By Henry Reed Burch and S. Howard Patterson

Elementary Principles of Economics

By Richard T. Ely and G. R. Wicker

Our Economic Organization

By Leon G. Marshall and Leverett S. Lyon

Social Civics

By William B. Munro and C. E. Ozanne

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

64-66 Fifth Avenue

New York

Government and the People

By Joseph Ragland Long

Professor of Constitutional Law, Washington and Lee University

A New Text Book In Civics For High Schools

Aside from the ordinary good features of the book, we commend for your attention:

1. The **unusual clearness** of presentation.
2. The illustrations which reenforce the facts presented in the text.
3. The **questions** at the end of each chapter which are based upon information presented in the chapter.
4. The **outstanding problems and topics for study** at the end of the book which are designed to stimulate thought and interest.
5. The **exact relation** between the **government** and the **people**.
6. Some interesting chapter subjects:
 - Citizenship
 - Popular Control in Government
 - Public Education
 - Commerce, Business, and Communication
 - Labor, Capital, and Industry
 - Social Problems and Regulations
 - Municipal Functions and Activities
 - The People of the United States
 - Natural Resources of the United States
 - National Defense
 - Foreign Relations of the United States

**It is Difficult To Conceive Of A Book More Simple,
More Complete, Or Better Suited For
A Civics Class Than**

“GOVERNMENT AND THE PEOPLE”

Price \$1.60

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS *Publishers*

FIFTH AVENUE AT 48th STREET,

NEW YORK

VITAL TEXTS

In History and the Social Sciences

THE WEBSTER HISTORIES

A Webster Book for Every Course

The famous series by the master-historian whose historical insight, skillfull organization of material, and brilliant style have won for his histories a phenomenal record throughout the country.

DUNN'S

COMMUNITY CIVICS FOR CITY SCHOOLS COMMUNITY CIVICS AND RURAL LIFE

Texts specialized in their application of civic principles to the distinctive needs of rural and urban communities. By the well-known Specialist in Civic Education of the United States Bureau of Education.

WILLIAMSON'S

PROBLEMS IN AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

A course in economics, sociology, and government which brings the student into direct contact with the great current issues of American life. This text has had the benefit of criticism and suggestion from eminent specialists on each topic presented.

D. C. Heath & Company,
Publishers

231-245 West 39th Street

New York

A Study of Government and Good Citizenship

THE AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

By S. E. FORMAN

*Used in the High
Schools in such cities
as:*

Hartford, Conn.
Washington, D. C.
Chicago, Ill.
Cincinnati, Ohio
Cleveland, Ohio
Flint, Mich.
Camden, N. J.
Columbus, Ohio
Erie, Pennsylvania
Columbia, S. Carolina
Trenton, N. J.
Urbana, Illinois
Youngstown, Ohio
Cedar Rapids, Iowa
Canton, Ohio

And in:

Bordentown Military
Academy
Hoboken Academy
New Mexico Military
Institute
The Nichols School
Trinity Park School
The Tome School
etc. etc. etc.

WHILE this text is based on the author's *Advanced Civics*, and embodies all the excellent features which have made that text so successful, it is essentially a new book. The *Education* magazine says: "The volume is perhaps the most elaborate and inclusive book for students of high school grade upon the market, and admirably arranged."

"IT emphasizes the spirit and work of government and traces historically the development of its machinery and functions in a way that gives meaning to them and makes for a progressive spirit," comments Professor Edward E. Hill, of Chicago Normal School. "The treatment of every subject is clear and concise. Through the use of its index and cross references one is able to get quickly a comprehensive idea of almost any governmental agency or political question of the day."

AND the *Boston Transcript* believes that "such a course as is given in this book should be required in all secondary schools in America."

12mo 475 pages Price \$1.75

*Teachers desiring to consider this
text with a view to adopting it, are
invited to write for more detailed
descriptive matter.*

THE CENTURY CO.

353 Fourth Avenue
New York

2126 Prairie Avenue
Chicago

Text Books *for the* Social Studies

Incorporating the Best Current National
Thought as to Content and Method

We and Our Government *Now Ready*

JEREMIAH WHIPPLE JENKS, PH. D., LL. D., *Research Professor of Government and Public Administration, New York University*

RUFUS DANIEL SMITH, M. A., *Associate Professor of Public Economy, New York University*

This book shows how our government is constituted and how it operates in the situations of everyday life. The entire text is repeated in a running series of more than five hundred news pictures, with consecutive captions, that put the whole objective side of American government and social institutions visually before the reader. 224 pages; price \$1.50.

We and Our Work *Ready March 15, 1923*

JOSEPH FRENCH JOHNSON, D. C. S., LL. D., *Dean and Professor of Political Economy and Finance, New York University*

"*We and Our Work*" has been written to meet the demand for a new work on Economics that is in harmony with advanced educational theory and practice. The present day emphasis on the Social Studies in the Secondary Schools, together with the rapid development of the Commercial, Vocational and Junior High Schools, have brought about an insistent demand from teachers for a book on the subject of Economics that is not merely an adaptation of an existing text for advanced readers. "*We and Our Work*" meets this demand. 300 pages 650 illustrations.

We and Our History *In Preparation* *A Biography of the American People*

ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, *Prof. of Government in Harvard University*

The title describes the purpose of the book. It is a brief account both of the development of the people who inhabit the country called the United States, and of their society and government. The viewpoint of the work is that the history of America is the history *not of occurrences but of human beings*. Each chapter ends with a brief account of the great man who best illustrates the epoch of which it treats.

THE AMERICAN VIEWPOINT SOCIETY

A Department of Boni and Liveright, Publishers

105 WEST 40th STREET

NEW YORK CITY

THE NEW WORLD

PROBLEMS IN POLITICAL GEOGRAPHY

By ISAIAH BOWMAN, PH. D.

Director of the American Geographical Society

Tells what has happened to the world as a consequence of the World War and the peace treaties, agreements, and understandings made between the various Powers. Outlines the new problems of nations in their historical and geographical settings and provides the background necessary for an understanding of the developments in the main international questions of our time. 215 hand-drawn maps make clear particular features of importance.

Cloth. vii+632 pages. Price \$6.00

WORLD BOOK COMPANY

Yonkers-on-Hudson, N. Y.

2126 Prairie, Ave., Chicago

Guitteau's Our United States

Revised Edition Ready January, 1923

The last chapter, regarding the Treaty of Versailles and the results of the World War, has been rewritten in the light of recent developments, and new material has been added on the presidential election of 1920, the Disarmament Conference, the Four Power-Pacific Treaty, and other events of the present administration.

New cuts have been inserted, including a full-page colored map of Europe in 1922; the index has been revised; and all statistics have been brought up to date.

A Seventh and Eighth Grade History

which connects the story of our national life with the rest of the world, which gives much attention to social and economic history, and which prepares the citizens of tomorrow for a better understanding of the past and a larger, clearer vision of the future.

SILVER, BURDETT & COMPANY

NEW YORK

NEWARK

BOSTON

CHICAGO

SPEAKING of the difficulty of obtaining reliable source material on current history John Cotton Dana, the well-known head of the Newark Public Library, said recently:

"The public needs easy access to original documents on the reconstruction of various countries. *The Nation* is the only American magazine which publishes such documents; and it is the source where they are most easily accessible."

Hundreds of students are using the documents in *The Nation's* International Relations Section every week. President J. M. Gambrill of your Association uses *The Nation* regularly in his classes. We should like to send you the special terms and details of our text-book service.

We can still supply some copies of Lewis Gannett's notable study of the Livre Noir and 11 other volumes on war responsibility, with the accompanying documents.

.....
The Nation, 20 Vesey Street, New York.

Send me free of charge your terms for class subscriptions to *The Nation*, with a sample copy of the magazine.

Name.....

Address.....

15 cents a copy

Annual subscription \$5.00

Ten Weeks for a Dollar.